USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

MALAWI DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT: OPERATIONAL PLAN FY2007 INDICATORS

November 2007

This publication was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development. It was prepared by Norman Olsen and Barry Silverman through the Global Health Technical Assistance Project.

MALAWI DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT: OPERATIONAL PLAN FY2007 INDICATORS

This document (Report No. 07-001-71) is available in printed or online versions. Online documents of GH TECH public reports can be located in the GH Tech web site library at www.ghtechproject.com/library/. Documents are also made available through the Development Experience Clearing House (www.dec.org). Additional information can be obtained from

The Global Health Technical Assistance Project
1250 Eye St., NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Tel: (202) 521-1900
Fax: (202) 521-1901
info@ghtechproject.com

This document was submitted by The QED Group, LLC, with CAMRIS International and Social & Scientific Systems, Inc., to the United States Agency for International Development under USAID Contract No. GHS-I-00-05-00005-00.

CONTENTS

TABLES

ACRONYMS

ACT	Artemisinin-based combination therapies
ADS	Automated Directive System
AED	Academy for Educational Development
AHS	Adventist Health Services
AI	Avian influenza
AIR	American Institute for Research
AMSTL	Active management of the third stage of labor
ANC	Antenatal care
CAADP	Comprehensive African Agricultural Development Program
CBDA	Community-based distribution agents
CBO	Community-based organization
CDC	U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
COMPASS II	Community Partnerships for Sustainable Resource Management in Malawi
CRS	Catholic Relief Services
CTO	Cognizant technical officer
CYP	Couple-years of protection
DAI	Development Alternatives, Inc.
DCA	USAID Development Credit Authority
DMS	Deepening Microfinance Sector Project
DQA	Data quality assessment
DOD	U.S. Department of Defense
DOTS	Directly Observed Therapy Short Course
EMIS	Education Management Information System
FEWSNET	Famine Early Warning System
FHI	Family Health International
FP	Family planning
GDA	Global Development Alliance
GIS	Global information system
GM	Growth-monitoring
GOM	Government of Malawi
GPRA	Government Performance and Results Act
GPS	Global positioning system
HTSS	Health Technical Support Services (Pharmaceutical)
IFPRI	International Food Policy Research Institute
IG	Inspector General
IMET	International Military Education and Training
IP	Implementing partner
IPT	Intermittent preventive treatment
IQC	Indefinite quantity contract
IRS	Indoor residual spraying

ITNs	Insecticide-treated nets
IUCD	Intrauterine contraceptive devices
JSI	John Snow, Inc.
LLITNS	Long-lasting insecticide-treated nets
LMIS	Logistics management information system
M&E	Monitoring and evaluation
MBG	Milk bulking group
MCC	Millennium Challenge Corporation
MCH	Maternal and child health
MDDA	Malawi Dairy Development Alliance
MDF	Malawi Defense Force
MDR-TB	Multidrug-resistant TB
MFI	Microfinance institution
MIE	Malawi Institute of Education
MNH	Maternal and neonatal health
MOE	Ministry of Education
MOH	Ministry of Health
MSH	Management Sciences for Health
MSMEs	Micro, small and medium-size enterprises
MTTA	Malawi Teacher Training Activity
MTTT	Mobile Teaching Training Troupe
MWR	Majete Wildlife Reserve
NEPAD	New Partnership for Africa's Development
NGO	Nongovernmental organization
NMCP	National Malaria Control Programme
NTP	National Tuberculosis Programme
OHT	Oral hydration therapy
OP	Operational plan
ORS	Oral rehydration salts
OVC	Orphans and vulnerable children
PAC	Post-abortion care
PAPA	Participating Agency Partnership Agreement
PCAR	Primary Curriculum and Assessment Reform
PCI	Project Concern International
PDA	Personal digital assistant
PEPFAR	President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief
PMI	President's Malaria Initiative
PMP	Performance monitoring plan
PMU	Program management unit
POU	Point of use
PPE	Personal protective equipment
PSI	Population Services International

PSSP	Primary School Support Program
RDTs	Rapid diagnostic tests
RH	Reproductive health
RMS	Regional medical stores
RPM Plus	Rational Pharmaceutical Management Plus (RPM Plus) Program
RTI	Research Triangle International
SAKSS	Strategic Analysis and Knowledge Support System
SDP	Service delivery point
SO	Strategic objective
SOW	Scope of work
SPA	Small Project Assistance Program
SUNY	State University of New York
SWAp	Sector-wide approach to health
TB	Tuberculosis
TBCAP	Tuberculosis Control Assistance Project
TLC	Total Landcare
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
USAID	U.S. Agency for International Development
USG	U.S. government
USPC	U.S. Peace Corps
V-I-P-R-T	Data quality standards: validity, integrity, precision, reliability, and timeliness
WHO	World Health Organization
WSU	Washington State University

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

BACKGROUND

USAID/Malawi requested that the GH Tech Project conduct a data quality assessment (DQA) of its FY2007 Operational Plan (OP) indicator data. The assessment included all the functional objectives of the OP and of the implementing partners (IPs). In addition, USAID/Malawi asked the GH Tech Project to examine selected indicators for the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) and the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC). Two GH Tech Project consultants, Norman L. Olsen and Barry Silverman, in conjunction with USAID/Malawi program monitoring and evaluation officers and cognizant technical officers (CTOs), conducted the assessment from October 19, 2007, to November 16, 2007.

According to USAID'S Automated Directive System (ADS), the purpose of a DQA is to ensure that the operating unit, USAID/Malawi, and its program area teams are aware of the strengths and weaknesses of their performance data and aware of the extent to which the data integrity can be trusted to influence management decisions. A DQA of each selected performance indicator helps validate the usefulness of the data.

The ADS mandates that "Data reported to USAID/Washington for Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) reporting purposes or for reporting externally on Agency performance must have a data quality assessment at some time within the three years before submission" (ADS 203.3.5.2). USAID/Malawi conducted a DQA in February 2007.

Through a DQA, Missions should ensure that the data being reported are measured against five data quality standards (abbreviated V-I-P-R-T):

- **Validity**—Data should clearly and adequately represent the intended result.
- **Integrity**—There should be established mechanisms in place as data are collected, analyzed, and reported to reduce the possibility that they are intentionally manipulated for any reason.
- **Precision**—Data should be sufficiently precise to present a fair picture of performance and enable management decision-making.
- **Reliability**—Data should reflect stable and consistent data collection processes and analysis methods over time.
- **Timeliness**—Data should be timely enough to influence management decision-making at the appropriate levels.

The ADS requires Missions to (1) review data collection, maintenance, and processing procedures to ensure that procedures are consistently applied and continue to be adequate; (2) identify areas for improvement, if possible; and (3) retain documentation of the DQA in their performance management files and update the information within three years. This current DQA is an updating of the last DQA conducted by USAID/Malawi in February 2004.

APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

The GH Tech team assessed the data quality of all standard indicators in the USAID/Malawi Country OP and a representative sample of PEPFAR and MCC indicators. Initially, the GH Tech team prepared a table showing the indicator and the partner responsible for reporting on it.

The GH Tech team and a representative of USAID/Malawi visited each of the major USAID partners. In preparation for partner visits, the team engaged in a dialogue with the responsible Program Area team and the CTO of each major partner. The team reviewed partner quarterly reports, any previous audit or performance reporting/verification documents, and site-visit trip notes generated by visiting CTOs. During partner visits,

the team engaged in dialogue with senior management and the officer or officers responsible for the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) function. As part of that dialogue, the team obtained an overview of the partner's program and its performance management practices. The team reviewed the partner's performance monitoring plan (PMP) with particular emphasis on the indicators and the evidence used to determine whether they have been achieved. The team also questioned the partners about procedures for collecting, compiling, and reporting of data by their subpartners. Spot checks were made of source data documents.

The GH Tech team used the DQA checklist during partner visits to ensure that the IPs had the technical capacity to collect data of appropriate quality, as evidenced by the fact that

- Written procedures are in place for data collection.
- Data collection processes are consistent from year to year.
- Data are collected using methods to address and minimize error.
- Data are collected by qualified personnel, who are properly trained and supervised.
- Duplicate data are detected and corrected.
- Safeguards are in place to prevent unauthorized changes to data.
- Source documents are maintained and readily available.

In a few cases, the GH Team visited with subpartners to observe primary data collection and recording processes.

MAJOR ASSESSMENT FINDINGS

OP INDICATORS

The GH Tech team concludes from its examination of IP data collection and reporting processes, procedures, and practices that the data reported in the FY2007 OP Annual Report of results meet the five data quality standards and pose minimal risk. The team bases this conclusion on the following major assessment findings:

1. All IPs have written procedures in place for data collection.
2. Data collection processes are consistent from year to year. In some cases, partners improved data collection instruments during implementation. In new projects data collection processes are being developed and the development requires special attention.
3. Most partners have procedures and practices in place to minimize error, including supervisory crosschecking of data.
4. Qualified and properly trained and supervised personnel collect data. IPs provide training, typically by training subpartner trainers. All levels receive training, including volunteer data collectors.
5. Most IPs have several layers of desk checking and spot crosschecking of data to eliminate duplication. Some partners are unaware that this is a potential problem.
6. IPs have put in place safeguards to prevent unauthorized changes to data. They include password-protected databases and frequent backup of the database.
7. Partners consistently maintain source documents, which in most cases were readily available when the GH Tech team requested them.

PEPFAR

The GH Tech team notes that in the recent Inspector General (IG) audit of Family Health International (FHI) the auditors could not confirm that the FHI data reached USAID standards because of insufficient contact at the field level. The health team has done excellent work in addressing the concerns outlined in the audit report; thus, the GH Tech team believes they have satisfied the concerns expressed by the auditors and FHI data are reliable for reporting and management purposes. The GH Tech team visited FHI offices and assessed the quality of the data reported for the three palliative care indicators and found that FHI did positively respond to the IG data audit findings and recommendation and the data reported for the FY2007 OP did appear to meet the DQA standards. The team also visited the current PEPFAR implementer, PACT/Malawi, and found that systems and procedures were in place to generate data that meet the DQA standards. The USAID/Malawi health team was to begin a more extensive and thorough DQA of all PEPFAR indicators in November 2007 that will include verifying data submitted by subpartners.

MILLENNIUM CHALLENGE CORPORATION

MCC activities will not be reported on standard indicators in the 2007 performance report, but the GH Tech team visited two partners implementing MCC projects, the State University of New York (SUNY) and Casals and Associates, and chose a representative sample of indicators to assess. DQA assessments were prepared on three indicators for each of the activities. Based on this examination, the team believes the data provided by each project meet USAID standards for management and reporting.

INDICATORS FOR SPECIAL FOLLOW-UP

In a few cases, the GH Tech team identified indicators that did not meet the data quality standards, such as Number of service delivery points (SDPs) reporting stock-outs of any contraceptive commodity offered by the SDP at any time during the reporting period. IPs are taking steps to correct this situation; USAID should follow up to assess these few indicators to ensure that they meet the quality standards.

The GH team believes that the data collected by USAID/Malawi IPs meet USAID standards for both management and reporting. However, most of them expressed a concern that the OP indicators were primarily output indicators and did not adequately describe the impact of partners' activities. In turn, the Mission is doing itself a potential disservice by not reporting completely on the impact of its portfolio. Many of the partners are in fact collecting and using impact data for management of their projects.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTION

As a follow-up to this DQA, USAID/Malawi should take steps to develop a "rolling," continuous DQA process. That is, USAID/Malawi should draft best practices for monitoring IP activities, including collection and reporting of data. The need is to provide the same level of information with no greater expenditure of time and resources while making information more useful in improving performance. To do this the GH Tech team suggests the following:

1. Develop a cohesive strategic view of how the program fits together, with both its component parts and the development of Malawi. From top to bottom, Mission personnel should have a clear view of what program impact is intended within the next three to five years and what indicators will measure achievement of that impact. Probably the most efficient means of doing this is to draft a short strategic narrative, followed by some type of strategic framework, matched up with a PMP.

2. Draw up a general Mission PMP that includes impact indicators to measure the success of the strategy. Impact indicators are essential to maintaining clear strategic focus. Most USAID/Malawi partners already collect some impact data, yet most of the indicators USAID/Malawi currently uses are output indicators. That is a necessary step but inadequate if the Mission is to make a significant contribution to the development of Malawi. A rolling DQA should also be part of the plan.

3. Review the fit between partner activities and the OP, which occasionally appears inexact. Targets should reflect reality in Malawi. Early in the programming year, the Mission should review with

partners the partners' targets and indicators. Based on this review, the Mission should then review the OP indicators to determine if standard indicators more accurately reflecting actual program activities are available, or if modifications can create a better fit. Set targets that partners can meet and that show gradual and appropriate improvement. The Mission probably needs to tailor some standard indicators to its specific program. The team advises using the standardized definitions but adding a Malawian context. The Mission should also review who is responsible for reporting on what indicators.

4. Increase field visits by Mission personnel. There is no substitute for face-to-face field contact. During field visits, take the opportunity to check partner data. Set a target of each CTO making one site visit per quarter. In particular, seek out opportunities to verify subpartner data. The DQA checklist should be used during these site visits.

5. As part of the portfolio review process, review partner performance data quarterly at the strategic objective level and no less than semi-annually by Mission management. The Mission may wish to consider staggering the review process by reviewing half the partners each quarter. A primary question needs to be, "Did the partner meet its indicator numbers?" If so, how? If not, why not?

6. Seek out best practices for dissemination. Similarly look for success stories—improvement in both the numbers and the lives of specific Malawian families.

7. Make the OP more user-friendly. The OP is a useful document in that it lists activities and outputs, but it is awkward to use. The GH team recognizes that a computer in Washington largely determines the shape of the document; the computer can use some clear human guidance from USAID/Malawi.

8. Create a process for accurately tracking the progress of centrally funded activities. The GH Tech team realizes this can be difficult. Start by listing projects the Mission is directly funding. If personnel resources permit, appoint someone to serve as a de facto CTO for centrally funded projects. Often Program Offices service this function.

9. Rationalize quarterly reporting formats across the portfolio and make provisions so that the Mission IT system can directly receive, record, and analyze partner reporting data. One size does not fit all, but it should be possible to create a Mission-wide format that each strategic objective (SO) can modify to meet specific program needs. The reporting template currently used by the Mission is an excellent starting point.

10. Disaggregate by gender when possible. This is not easy to do, but showing positive gender results is normally a help in budget negotiations.

11. To augment the rolling DQA, USAID/Malawi should consider including DQA as a component of all project or program evaluations, allowing adequate time to check subpartner data collection.

12. USAID/Malawi should consider holding a conference with its partners to improve implementation by better use of performance data. Almost all the partners that the GH Tech team visited expressed strong interest in a follow-up that would help them upgrade their data management skills. Holding a one- to two-day conference that looks at data collection as a way to improve performance will pay significant dividends. The challenge, as the GH Tech team sees it, is continuing to collect high quality output data but expanding the indicators to focus greater attention on impact—but doing so with the same expenditure of time and resources, and then integrating that information into daily activities.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND

USAID/Malawi requested that the GH Tech Project conduct an external DQA of its OP FY2007 indicators across its portfolio. Two GH Tech Project consultants conducted the evaluation from October 24, 2007, through November 16, 2007.

According to USAID'S ADS, the purpose of a DQA is to ensure that the operating unit, USAID/Malawi, and its element teams are aware of the strengths and weaknesses of their performance data and of the extent to which data integrity can be trusted to influence management decisions. A DQA of each performance indicator helps validate the usefulness of the data.

The ADS mandates that "Data reported to USAID/Washington for Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) reporting purposes or for reporting externally on Agency performance must have a data quality assessment at some time within the three years before submission" (ADS 203.3.5.2). USAID/Malawi conducted a DQA in February 2007.[1]

Through a DQA, Missions should measure the data they report against five data quality standards (abbreviated V-I-P-R-T). These five standards are defined in Table 1.

TABLE 1: DQA STANDARDS

STANDARD	DEFINITION
Validity	Data should clearly and adequately represent the intended results. While proxy data may be used, the Mission must consider how well the data measure the intended result. Another issue is whether data reflect bias, such as interviewer bias, unrepresentative sampling, or transcription bias.
Integrity	When data are collected, analyzed, and reported, there should be mechanisms in place to reduce the possibility that they are intentionally manipulated for any reason, such as political or personal. Data integrity is at greatest risk of being compromised during data collection and analysis.
Precision	Data should be sufficiently precise to present a fair picture of performance and enable management decision-making at the appropriate levels. One issue is whether data are at an appropriate level of detail to influence related management decisions. A second issue is what margin of error (the amount of variation normally expected from a given data collection process) is acceptable given the management decisions likely to be affected.
Reliability	Data should reflect stable and consistent data collection processes and analysis methods over time. The key issue is whether analysts and managers would come to the same conclusions if the data collection and analysis process were repeated. Mission should be confident that progress toward performance targets reflects real changes rather than variations in data collection methods. When data collection and analysis change, PMPs should be updated.
Timeliness	Data should be timely enough to influence management decisions-making at the appropriate levels. One key issue is whether the data are available frequently enough to influence the appropriate level of management decisions. A second is whether data are current enough when they are reported.

[1] Data Quality Assessment – USAID Malawi, Olsen NL, Mwangi JM, Sichinga K, February 16-27, 2004.

The ADS also states that "in some cases, performance data will not fully meet all five standards." Where this is the case, Missions should document and report known data limitations. The ADS allows significant variation as to a DQA format. It states only that Missions should

- Review data collection, maintenance, and processing procedures to ensure that the procedures are consistently applied and continue to be adequate.
- Identify areas for improvement if possible.
- Retain documentation of the DQA in the Mission's performance management files and update the information within three years. Documentation may be as simple as memoranda of conversations with data sources and informed officials.

Since IPs report performance data to the Mission, the DQA should focus on written procedures and training for cross-checking data. The Mission should ensure that the IPs have the technical capacity to collect data of appropriate quality, as evidenced by the following:

- Written procedures are in place for data collection.
- Partners use a consistent data collection process from year to year.
- Data collection process methods minimize sampling and nonsampling errors.
- Qualified, properly trained, and supervised personnel collect the data.
- Duplicate data are detected.
- Safeguards are in place to prevent unauthorized changes to the data.
- Source documents are maintained and readily available.[2]

1.2 SCOPE OF WORK (SEE ANNEX A)

The Scope of Work (SOW) responds to USAID/Malawi's request that GH Tech conduct a DQA for all its indicators and each SO team outlined in the FY2007 OP. USAID/Malawi has four SO teams: Sustainable Economic Growth; Health, Population and Nutrition; Education; and Democracy and Good Governance/Millennium Challenge Corporation Initiative.

USAID/Malawi wants to ensure that all performance data reported to USAID/Washington meet all the data quality standards of ADS 203 and that they are valid, complete, accurate, and consistent with management needs. The GH Tech team will therefore conduct a comprehensive DQA of USAID/Malawi partners and grantees as a follow-up to the DQA of February 2004.

The purpose of the exercise is to assess the data management systems of USAID/Malawi development program partners and grantees by analyzing program indicators using U.S. government (USG) data quality standards of validity, integrity, precision, reliability, and timeliness (V-I-P-R-T) as specified in the USAID ADS 203 series. The assessment will also support and facilitate the improvement of the performance monitoring systems of USAID/Malawi partners.

The DQA will assess the quality of data and information submitted by partners and grantees by analyzing the process by which partners collect, store, and transmit data to USAID/Malawi and USAID/Washington. It will highlight strengths and weaknesses of USAID/Malawi primary and secondary data and provide a plan for improving the data management systems of USAID/Malawi and IPs. In summary, the DQA will:

---

[2] From "Data Quality Assessments- Questions and Answers" by Jeffrey Swedberg, ANE/SPO/DIS, January 24, 2006

- Assess the quality of data submitted by USAID/Malawi partners in relation to the V-I-P-R-T data quality standards.
- Assess the systems USAID/Malawi partners use to collect and analyze data.
- Assess the flow of information and data from the initial collection point to higher levels in the organization.
- Assess the management information systems partners use to record, maintain, and report data.
- Identify areas of potential vulnerability that affect the general credibility and usefulness of the data.
- Recommend measures to address any identified weaknesses in the data submitted by USAID/Malawi partners and data from secondary sources and in the M&E procedures and systems in place at both partner level and USAID.

The assessment will be conducted in collaboration with the Mission's M&E unit and include a capacity-building exercise for the unit.

The GH Tech DQA team will provide the following deliverables:

- Workshop for Mission M&E unit
- Report on the DQA for USAID/Malawi partners
- Debriefing with USAID/Malawi management staff and SO teams on the DQA
- Recommendations for improving data management systems within USAID/Malawi
- Recommendations for improving the quality of USAID/Malawi partners' data
- Copies of the final report of taking into account constructive suggestions from the stakeholders.

1.3 FORMAT OF THE DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT

After this introduction and a list of the performance indicators included in the DQA, chapter 2 presents a brief description of the methodology used by the DQA team. It then covers the indicators assessed for each USAID/Malawi program element. Wherever the DQA team found significant weaknesses or strengths for an indicator related to a particular assessment criterion, the team provided summary findings and recommendations. In some cases, there were no significant findings, and consequently no findings or recommendations appear in chapter 2. Annex C contains DQA checklists for each indicator, giving detailed comments on strengths and weaknesses regarding each assessment criterion.

The Mission also asked the GH Tech team to provide recommendations based on the DQA for possible future steps the Mission can take to ensure the quality of performance data.

2. APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

In assessing the data quality used to report on the indicators, the GH Tech team followed the procedures stated in the ADS and the methodology outlined in the Performance Management Toolkit.

The GH Tech team assessed the data quality of all standard indicators in the USAID/Malawi Country Operational Plan and a representative sample of PEPFAR and MCC indicators. The team began by preparing a table showing the indicator and the partner responsible for reporting on it.

The GH Tech team and a representative of USAID/Malawi visited each of the major USAID partners. In preparation for the visits, the team engaged in a dialogue with the responsible program area team and the CTO of each major partner. The team reviewed partner quarterly reports, any previous audit or performance reporting and verification documents, and site visit trip notes generated by visiting CTOs.

During partner visits, the team engaged in dialogue with senior management and the officer or officers responsible for the M&E function. As part of that dialogue, the team obtained an overview of each partner's program and its performance management practices. The team reviewed partner PMPs with particular emphasis on the indicators and the evidence used to determine whether those indicators had been achieved. The team also questioned partners about procedures for collecting, compiling, and reporting of data from their subpartners. Spot checks were made of source data documents.

The GH Tech team used the DQA checklist during partner visits to ensure that IPs had the technical capacity to collect data of appropriate quality as evidenced by the following:

- There are written procedures for data collection.
- Data collection processes are consistent from year to year.
- Data are collected using methods to address and minimize error.
- Data are collected by qualified personnel who are properly trained and supervised.
- Duplications of data are detected and corrected.
- Safeguards are in place to prevent unauthorized changes to data.
- Source documents are maintained and readily available.

In a few cases, the GH Tech team visited with subpartners to observe primary data collection and recording processes.

A DQA checklist was prepared for each common indicator that USAID/Malawi partners are responsible for reporting on. Using the checklist as the point of departure, the GH Tech team checked data from the partners for **validity, precision, reliability, timeliness, and integrity.**

USAID/Malawi's IPs report on activities in support of the Mission's FY2007 OP and in support of the following Strategic Goals, Program Areas, and Program Elements. This DQA report follows the same scheme:

- Functional Objective 1: Achieving Peace and Security
  - Program Area: Stabilization Operations and Security Sector Reform
    - Element: Defense, Military, and Border Restructuring and Operations
- Functional Objective 2: Governing Justly and Democratically
  - Program Area: Political Competition and Consensus-Building

        - Element: Elections and Political Process
        - Element: Program Support (Political Competition)
- Functional Objective 3: Investing in People
    - Program Area: Health
        - Element: Tuberculosis
        - Element: Malaria
        - Element: Avian Influenza
        - Element: Maternal and Child Health
        - Element: Family Planning and Reproductive Health
    - Program Area: Education
        - Element: Basic Education
    - Program Area: Social and Economic Services and Protection for Vulnerable Populations
        - Element: Social Assistance
- Functional Objective 4: Promoting Economic Growth and Prosperity
    - Program Area: Agriculture
        - Element: Agricultural Enabling Environment
        - Element: Agricultural Sector Productivity
        - Element: Program Support (Agriculture)
    - Program Area: Environment
        - Element: Natural Resources and Biodiversity
        - Element: Program Support (Environment)
- Functional Objective 5: Providing Humanitarian Assistance
    - Program Area: Disaster Readiness
        - Element: Capacity Building, Preparedness, and Planning

USAID/Malawi FY2007 OP indicators by SO, Program Area, and Element can be found in Annex B.

3. DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FINDINGS

3.1 FUNCTIONAL GOAL: PEACE AND SECURITY

3.1.1 PROGRAM AREA: STABILIZATION OPERATIONS AND SECURITY SECTOR REFORM

Overview: Continued training of the Malawi Defense Force (MDF) officers in the U.S. is essential for maintaining the high level of training of the MDF, a relatively well-trained, professional military with a strong history of respect for civilian control, thus reinforcing civilian control of the military and encouraging international peacekeeping.

3.1.1.1 Element: Defense, Military, and Border Security Restructuring and Operations

Overview: Malawi's International Military Education and Training (IMET) program is central to U.S. engagement with the Malawi Defense Force (MDF). The GH Tech team notes that nearly all senior and most mid-level officers receive training in this program. The program specifically targets those soldiers whom the MDF expect to advance quickly up the ranks. The training they receive will make the most impact and they will form impressions favorable to the United States during training, impressions that will remain with them as they reach senior leadership positions and will facilitate the future accomplishment of USG objectives in Malawi. All courses are selected in conjunction with the MDF; the USG strives to meet MDF training needs.

The two FY2007 OP indicators for Defense, Military, and Border Restructuring and Operations are shown below in table 2. The U.S. Department of Defense (DOD) implements IMET.

TABLE 2: DEFENSE, MILITARY, AND BORDER SECURITY RESTRUCTURING AND OPERATIONS INDICATORS

Program Element Indicators: Defense, Military, and Border Security Restructuring and Operations	Prime Partner Name
Number of U.S.-trained personnel at national leadership levels	U.S. Department of Defense
Number of host country military personnel trained to maintain territorial integrity	U.S. Department of Defense

Below is the summary of DQA findings for DOD with respect to the collection, compilation, analysis, and reporting of data for the two indicators shown in Table 2. For details of the DQA, see the checklist in Annex C.

Partner: U.S. Department of Defense

Overview: The DOD implements the IMET program, an ongoing activity, and has had tremendous success in training those at the highest levels of the MDF command. During FY2007 IMET, the USG planned to train 22 students in subjects ranging from field artillery to air traffic control. Also in FY 2007, at the MDF's request, the USG is sending three officers to the prestigious yearlong courses at the Army War College and Air Command and Staff College. The USG will also send two officers to intelligence courses, a major contribution to "Counter Terrorism." This training is essential to USG cooperation with the MDF and has proven to be an excellent investment over the years. Nearly all high-ranking officers, including nine of twelve generals, have been trained in the IMET program and returned to leadership positions within the military.

DOD DQA: The GH Tech team in combination with Archanjel Chinkunda, USAID/Malawi M&E officer, visited DOD offices to review how training data are collected. Katezi Zimba, military program assistant, and John Letvin, political/military officer, briefed the team. The two indicators accurately reflect the training DOD is conducting for the MDF. Military Program Assistance is fully qualified to manage this program, including collecting all the relevant data.

Because of the relatively small number of trainees and well-established processing procedures, neither data error nor transcription error is a major issue in this program. The data collection processes have been stable for a number of years. The DOD reviews all data for each training course and prepares a consolidated report.

TABLE 3: DQA STANDARDS SUMMARY—U.S. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE			
STANDARD	YES	NO	COMMENT
Validity	X		See text above
Integrity	X		See text above
Precision	X		See text above
Reliability	X		See text above
Timeliness	X		See text above

DOD data for tracking of trainees meets DQA and USAID data standards.

3.2 FUNCTIONAL GOAL: GOVERNING JUSTLY AND DEMOCRATICALLY

3.2.1 PROGRAM AREA: POLITICAL COMPETITION AND CONSENSUS BUILDING

Overview: Holding local and national elections is a cornerstone of the maturing of Malawi`s democracy. While the Government of Malawi (GOM) has publicly committed itself to local elections in 2008, the following issues still need to be addressed: the preparation time required for free and fair elections, the costs, and who will pay those costs. Over the next five years, strengthening Malawian democracy will require civic education, institution building, and enhancement of government legitimacy through continued free and fair elections. To meet these goals, by FY2008 more than 500,000 citizens will need to receive civic education so that they understand their voting rights and responsibilities, and over 150 election officials will need training in electoral administration.

3.2.1.1 Element: Elections and Political Processes

Overview: Over the next five years, the USG will promote continued stability and peace in southern Africa by promoting effective democratic elections. In FY2007, USAID/Malawi supported preparatory work for elections and related political processes. This included 1) supporting efforts by civil society (including the media) to provide the basic civic education necessary for informed voter participation; 2) assisting in the development of accurate and complete voter rolls that do not disenfranchise marginalized groups such as the rural poor (who are the majority in Malawi); and 3) contributing to multidonor efforts to build institutional capacity at the Malawi Elections Commission.

This new activity is not yet reporting indicator data.

3.3 FUNCTIONAL GOAL: INVESTING IN PEOPLE

3.3.1 PROGRAM AREA: HEALTH

Overview: Malawi's major health challenges are the prevalence of HIV/AIDS (14%); high fertility (6%); and high infant, child, and maternal mortality rates (76/1,000, 133/1,000, and 984/100,000 respectively). The USG will continue to support the Sector-Wide Approach to Health (SWAp) through initiatives aimed at "Increased use of improved health behaviors and services for maternal, child and reproductive health, including HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria."

3.3.1.1 Element: Tuberculosis

Overview: Tuberculosis (TB) is a serious public health problem in Malawi. Malawi's estimated TB incidence increased from 257/100,000 in 1990 to 413/100,000 in 2004—the 14th highest incidence rate in the world. At least 72 percent of TB patients are also HIV-positive. USAID/Malawi is supporting the Malawi national TB

control program through the centrally funded Tuberculosis Control Assistance Project (TBCAP). In Malawi, Management Sciences for Health (MSH) is coordinating TBCAP.

The seven FY2007 OP indicators for TB are shown in Table 4. One IP, KNCV Tuberculosis Foundation, reports data contributing to these indicators through MSH.

TABLE 4: TUBERCULOSIS INDICATORS	
PROGRAM ELEMENT INDICATORS: TUBERCULOSIS	PRIME PARTNER NAME
1. Case notification rate in new sputum smear positive pulmonary TB cases in USG supported areas (SD)	KNCV Tuberculosis Foundation
2. Number of people trained in DOTS with USG funding (SD)	KNCV Tuberculosis Foundation
3. Average population per USG-supported laboratory performing TB microscopy with over 95% correct results	KNCV Tuberculosis Foundation
4. Percent of all registered TB patients who are tested for HIV through USG supported programs (SD)	KNCV Tuberculosis Foundation
5. Existence of multidrug resistance for TB at the national level (Y/N)	KNCV Tuberculosis Foundation
6. Number of TB cases reported to the National TB Programme (NTP) by USG-assisted non-Ministry of Health (MOH) groups (SD)	KNCV Tuberculosis Foundation
7. Percent of USG-supported laboratories performing TB microscopy with over 95% correct microscopy results	KNCV Tuberculosis Foundation

The following summarizes DQA findings for KNCV/MSH with respect to the collection, compilation, analysis, and reporting of data for the seven indicators shown in Table 4. MSH is responsible for reporting indicator data to USAID/Malawi. (For details of the DQA, see the checklist in Annex C.)

Partner: KNCV Tuberculosis Foundation

Partner Overview: Under the FY2007 OP USAID has one primary IP, KNCV Tuberculosis Foundation, contributing to seven TB indicators. KNCV TB Foundation is implementing the TBCAP program, which is strengthening directly observed therapy short course (DOTS) programs by increasing case detection and treatment success. This includes prevention and control of multidrug resistant TB (MDR-TB) and work with individuals that are co-infected with HIV. There are three sub-partners for TBCAP: MSH, the World Health Organization (WHO), and FHI. Collaborators include REACH Trust and Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine. TBCAP operates in Zomba and Mangochi Districts. MSH is responsible for data collection, analysis, and reporting.

DQA—KNCV/MSH

The DQA team with Nyembezi Mfune, USAID/Malawi Program Acquisition and Assistance Specialist, and Lily Banda-Maliro, USAID/Malawi Deputy Team Leader (Health Office), visited the MSH/TBCAP, located at the offices of the NTP, on November 6, 2007. June D. Mwafulirwa, TBCAP Project Coordinator, and Maxwell Moyo, TBCAP M&E specialist, briefed the team. The team obtained an overview of the TBCAP program and its performance management practices, including its reporting plan. TBCAP started in Malawi in April 2007 and has not completely implemented the reporting system. For most of their OP indicators, USAID/Malawi uses national MOH data to report on activities in the two implementation districts. This includes:

- Case notification rate in new sputum smear positive pulmonary TB cases in USG-supported areas
- Average population per USG-supported laboratories performing TB microscopy with over 95 percent correct results
- Percent of all registered TB patients who are tested for HIV through USG-supported programs
- Number of TB cases reported to NTP by USG-assisted NON-MOH sector (SD)
- Percent of USG-supported laboratories performing TB microscopy with over 95 percent correct microscopy results

Facility- and community-based data are collected at the local level and compiled and analyzed at the district level. A district coordinator reviews the data and follows up on any questions or data issues. District-level data are compiled at the zone level and reviewed by a zone coordinator. Reviewed data are then reported to MSH/TBCAP quarterly. MSH to date (July-September 2007) has received only one report. The project coordinator indicated that there were plans for data collection and use training for both TBCAP and MOH staff.

Records of training were crosschecked (number of people trained in DOTS with USG funding) by the team and appeared to be valid and reliable. The team crosschecked the partner's data collection methodology against the USAID approved methodology as reflected in the DQA checklists.

TBCAP addresses transcription error by spot-checking data records at the district and zone levels, with corrective actions taken at each level if necessary.

TABLE 5: DQA STANDARDS SUMMARY—KNCV/MSH
(INDICATOR: NUMBER OF PEOPLE TRAINED IN DOTS WITH USG FUNDING*)

STANDARD	YES	NO	COMMENT
Validity	X		The data meet the standard. However, because most of the data reported for the FY2007 OP indicators were derived from national MOH data disaggregated for the implementation districts, USAID/Malawi should further investigate to determine the validity of the data. This is not to question their validity but merely to indicate that the DQA did not investigate the primary source of data.
Integrity	X		Because most of the data reported for the FY2007 OP indicators were derived from national MOH data disaggregated for the implementation districts, USAID/Malawi should further investigate to determine the integrity of the data. This is not to question the integrity but merely to indicate that the DQA did not investigate the primary source of data.
Precision	X-		Because much of the data reported for the FY2007 OP indicators were derived from national MOH, data disaggregated for the implementation districts, USAID/Malawi should further investigate to determine the precision of the data. This is not to question the precision but merely to indicate that the DQA did not investigate the primary source of data.
Reliability	X		The data meet this standard. However, because much of the

TABLE 5: DQA STANDARDS SUMMARY—KNCV/MSH (INDICATOR: NUMBER OF PEOPLE TRAINED IN DOTS WITH USG FUNDING*)			
STANDARD	YES	NO	COMMENT
			data reported for the FY2007 OP indicators were derived from national MOH data disaggregated for the implementation districts USAID/Malawi should further investigate to determine the reliability of the data. This is not to question reliability but merely to indicate that the DQA did not investigate the primary source of data.
Timeliness	X-		Only one quarterly report has been received by MSH TBCAP.

*For this indicator, MSH was the primary source for the first four standards.

It is recommended that during the next data collection cycle Mission staff conduct spot-checks by visits to TBCAP offices, district and zonal office, and observe data collection at the facility or community level.

3.3.1.2 Element: Malaria

Overview: Malaria is a serious public health and economic problem in Malawi. The MOH estimates that there are 8 million cases annually and that the disease is responsible for about 40 percent of hospital deaths in children under 5. USAID, as part of the President's Malaria Initiative (PMI), is working to reduce malaria-related mortality through a comprehensive approach that includes (1) increasing coverage of long-lasting insecticide-treated nets (LLITNS); (2) increasing coverage of intermittent preventive treatment (IPT) of malaria in pregnancy; (3) introducing indoor residual spraying (IRS) in selected areas; and (4) facilitating the transition to artemisinin-based combination therapies (ACTs) as the first-line antimalarial drug.

USAID/Malawi, through PMI, is supporting the National Malaria Control Programme (NMCP) by providing technical assistance from central programs such as the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC)/USAID Interagency Agreement and the Rational Pharmaceuticals Plus and ACCESS projects to implement IPT and introduce ACTs. USAID/Malawi is also supporting existing projects, such as Population Services International's (PSI) net distribution program and procures malaria-related commodities through the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF).

The nine FY2007 OP Indicators for malaria are shown in Table 6.

TABLE 6: MALARIA INDICATORS	
PROGRAM ELEMENT INDICATORS: MALARIA	PRIME PARTNER NAME
1. Number of ITNs distributed that were purchased or subsidized with USG support	PSI; UNICEF
2. Number of houses sprayed with insecticide with USG support	Research Triangle International (RTI)
3. Number of evaluations conducted by the USG (process/results/impact/other)	CDC
4. Number of information-gathering or research activities conducted by the USG	CDC
5. Number of people trained in malaria treatment or prevention with USG funds (SD)	JHPIEGO, A nonprofit affiliate of Johns Hopkins University; MSH

TABLE 6: MALARIA INDICATORS	
PROGRAM ELEMENT INDICATORS: MALARIA	PRIME PARTNER NAME
6. Number of ACTs purchased and distributed with USG support	MSH; UNICEF
7. Number of improvements to laws, policies, regulations, or guidelines related to improved access to and use of health services drafted with USG support	CDC; MSH
8. Number of USG-assisted SDPs experiencing stock-outs of specific tracer drugs	MSH
9. Number of people reached through community outreach activities that promote the correct and consistent use of LLITNs	TBD

Partner: Population Services International

Partner Overview: The Enhanced HIV/AIDS Prevention and Improved Family Health project implemented by PSI distributes and socially markets health-related commodities and increases awareness of the availability of these commodities. During FY2007, PSI planned to distribute approximately 800,000 LLITNS to children under 5 and pregnant women through antenatal clinics, village health committees, and the private sector. They also planned to develop information, education, communication, and mass media materials to improve the correct and consistent use of the nets. PSI planned to support the implementation of ACTs in Malawi by developing a mass media campaign to educate the population on changes in the malaria drug policy. Over 1,500,000 children under 5 and pregnant women are expected to benefit from these activities. By providing the network to distribute LLITNs in Malawi and by conducting mass media campaigns to educate the population on ACT and LLITN use, PSI is contributing to the scale-up of LLITNs and the effective implementation of ACTs. Increasing LLITN and ACT coverage and use should help reduce malaria-related mortality in Malawi.

PSI reports data that contribute to one FY2007 OP Indicator—

- Number of ITNs distributed that were purchased or subsidized with USG support

DQA—PSI

The GH Tech team, Archanjel Chinkunda, USAID/Malawi M&E officer, and Humphreys Shumba, CTO, on November 5, 2007 visited the PSI offices, where John Justino, Resident Director; Alfred Zulu, Director of Administration; Michael Kainga, Internal Auditor; and Andrew Miller, Director of Communications briefed us on the PSI program and performance management practices. The GH Tech team reviewed the partner PMP with particular emphasis on indicators and the evidence used to determine whether the indicators have been achieved. The GH Tech team assessed the linkage between PSI's PMPs and those of USAID/Malawi, and crosschecked its data collection methodology against the USAID-approved methodology as reflected in the DQA checklists. The team also crosschecked PSI SO PMP indicators against indicators in the USAID/Malawi OP and spot-checked PSI's files for base documents and documentation of the evidence demonstrating achievement of the indicator (e.g., sales records, warehouse stocking reports, and sales representative reports). The team spot-checked approximately 30 shops in Blantyre, Zomba, and rural marketing centers to see if it was possible to buy condoms, oral rehydration salts (ORS), WaterGuard, and ITNs. Condoms, ORS, and WaterGuard were available in almost all of the shops. The larger shops, about one in ten, had ITNs. The team also spot-checked operational manuals to confirm the existence of written procedures.

The indicators accurately measure the effectiveness of the PSI sales program in all the aspects of health that it is addressing. At all levels the PSI personnel are highly qualified, effectively trained, and aggressively

supervised. There is an extensive system of crosschecking. There is a financial penalty for persons committing errors in recording data**.** PSI has extensive experience in social marketing and is well aware of the difficulties in collecting accurate data. Its procedures, with extensive crosschecking and field verification, effectively address these issues. Crosschecking effectively addresses any transcription error issues. Procedures for data collection have been consistent since the project began.

TABLE 7: DQA STANDARDS SUMMARY—PSI			
STANDARD	YES	NO	COMMENT
Validity	X		See text above
Integrity	X		See text above
Precision	X		See text above
Reliability	X		See text above
Timeliness	X		See text above

The data collected by PSI meets USAID standards for management and reporting. The data are of high quality, but generally, impact is not measured. The PSI program appears to be a model for excellent data collection. The GH Tech team recommends that USAID/Malawi closely examine the system of crosschecks to determine if there are best practices that other programs could effectively use.

Partner: UNICEF

Partner Overview: The UNICEF grant provides USAID with a relationship with UNICEF's Supply Division to procure malaria-related commodities During FY07, the PMI in Malawi planned to procure 800,000 LLITNs, approximately 150,000 malaria rapid diagnostic tests (RDTs), and $5.9 million worth of ACTs drugs in support of the National Malaria Control Program. Once the LLITNs are distributed, household ownership of ITNs will increase to 80 percent in Malawi. The procurement of ACTs and RDTs will enable the GOM to change its first-line treatment for malaria to the more effective ACTs. Increasing LLITN and ACT coverage and use should contribute to a reduction in malaria-related mortality in Malawi.

UNICEF reports data that contribute to two FY2007 OP indicators:

- Number of ITNs distributed that were purchased or subsidized with USG support
- Number of ACTs purchased and distributed through with support

DQA—UNICEF

The GH Tech team and Archanjel Chinkunda, USAID/Malawi M&E officer, visited the UNICEF offices where Ketema Bizuneh, Project Officer of the Child Health Unit, briefed us on the UNICEF malaria prevention and treatment program. The team reviewed the UNICEF PMP with particular emphasis on the indicators and the evidence used to determine whether they have been achieved. The team assessed the linkage between the UNICEF and USAID/Malawi PMPs, and crosschecked UNICEF data collection methodology against the USAID-approved methodology as reflected in the DQA checklists. The team also crosschecked UNICEF and SO PMP indicators against indicators in the USAID/Malawi OP. The team spot-checked UNICEF files for base documents and documentation of the evidence demonstrating that indicators have been achieved, and spot-checked operational manuals to confirm the existence of written procedures.

The UNICEF program, partly financed by USAID purchases of commodities, provides those commodities to the GOM to distribute. These indicators accurately measure the scope of that program. The UNICEF personnel doing the purchasing and providing the logistics are well qualified and properly supervised. UNICEF also provides training to village workers in maintaining supply registries. UNICEF uses multiple sources of data, which tends to reduce the amount of error. There is adequate crosschecking of data to detect and correct errors.

UNICEF has accurately assessed the difficulties of developing and maintaining a malaria supply chain to the GOM. There is some difficulty with transcription error, although for the most part it resides on the GOM side of the operation. Transcription error appears to be within acceptable tolerances for a program of this type. Several documents adequately describe data quality issues and efforts to address them.

Data collection procedures have been stable since the beginning of the activity and meet international standards. UNICEF regularly reviews program data as part of ongoing management. Quarterly reports document those reviews. Procedures are in place to avoid double counting of commodities.

TABLE 8: DQA STANDARDS SUMMARY—UNICEF			
STANDARD	YES	NO	COMMENT
Validity	X		See text above
Integrity	X		See text above
Precision	X		See text above
Reliability	X		See text above
Timeliness	X		See text above

The data meet DQA and USAID standards for managing and reporting on this program. The limitations are mainly in the GOM handling and distribution of the commodities.

Partner: Research Triangle International (RTI)

Partner Overview: The IRS indefinite quantity contract (IQC) implemented by RTI provides a worldwide procurement mechanism to implement IRS programs by proving cost-effective commodities procurement for IRS, IRS logistics systems support, technical expertise, and implementation support for IRS programs. During FY2007, the PMI in Malawi worked with the IRS IQC and the NMCP to introduce IRS in the Nkhotakota District. This IRS program worked in partnership with local sugar estates and protected an estimated population of 125,000 persons. Typically, sprayed households remain protected from malaria for three to six months. By implementing IRS in Malawi, the IRS IQC is introducing a highly effective tool for preventing malaria. Increasing the capacity of Malawi to implement and scale-up IRS will reduce malaria-related mortality in sprayed areas.

RTI reports data that contribute to one FY2007 OP Indicator:

- Number of houses sprayed with insecticide with USG support

DQA—RTI

Did not visit or assess data quality.

Partner: Centers for Disease Control (CDC)

Partner Overview: CDC is a key implementing partner in the PMI in Malawi. The CDC/USAID Interagency Agreement provides support for infectious disease control and prevention in developing countries by providing technical expertise from CDC. During FY2007 as part of the PMI USAID/Malawi will (1) support CDC efforts to provide technical expertise to the NMCP to conduct vital anemia and parasitemia studies and support malaria entomological assessments; (2) strengthen the Malawi health information system; and (3) post a resident advisor in Malawi who will provide technical assistance to the NMCP and assist in the implementation of the PMI. Through CDC's activities, USAID and the PMI are helping to increase the NMCP`s capacity to manage and monitor malaria-control-related activities and will provide the NMCP with essential information on malaria-related mortality and entomological patterns in Malawi.

CDC reports data that contribute to three FY2007 OP Indicators:

- Number of evaluations conducted by the USG (process/results/impact/other)
- Number of information-gathering or research activities conducted by the USG
- Number of improvements to laws, policies, regulations, or guidelines related to improved access to and use of health services drafted with USG support

DQA—CDC

The GH Tech team, Archanjel Chinkunda, USAID/Malawi M&E Officer, and Phyles Kachingwe, CTO, visited the CDC Malaria Malawi Program and the College of Medicine Malaria Alert Center. Carl H. Campbell, Director of the CDC Program, and Nyson Chizani, Data Manager and Statistician, briefed the team, giving it an overview of the CDC/Malaria Alert Program and its performance management practices. The team reviewed CDC PMP indicators and the evidence used to determine whether indicators have been achieved and assessed the linkage between CDC and USAID/Malawi PMPs. The team crosschecked the CDC data collection methodology against the USAID-approved methodology as reflected in the DQA checklists. It also crosschecked CDC and SO PMP indicators against indicators in the USAID/Malawi OP, and spot-checked the CDC files for base documents and documentation of the evidence demonstrating achievement of the indicator results. For example, the team examined the tracking system for documenting policy changes. It also spot-checked operational manuals to confirm the existence of written procedures.

The three indicators for the CDC/Malaria Program accurately measure progress being made by the malaria program. The Data Management Specialist closely supervises data collection in all its elements and trains enumerators for the various surveys done by the project. For example, enumerators are trained in the use of personal digital assistant (PDA) tools for data collection. The program uses a system of internal checks whereby the program staff thoroughly review reports for transcription or other errors.

Basic procedures have been stable since the beginning of the program. CDC periodically reviews the data, especially in preparation of reports to MOH/NMCP, CDC headquarters, and USAID. Written procedures are in place to guide data collection, review, and maintenance. The program allows relatively open access to the data, but there is little incentive for anyone to make unauthorized changes to the data. In addition, the use of the local area network and password protection prevent unauthorized changes.

TABLE 9: DQA STANDARDS SUMMARY—CDC

STANDARD	YES	NO	COMMENT
Validity	X		See text above
Integrity	X		See text above
Precision	X		See text above
Reliability	X		See text above
Timeliness	X		See text above

The data meet USAID quality standards for management and reporting. USAID/Malawi should closely monitor the situation to ensure that data collection quality and management are maintained. CDC is also a possible source of best practices that other USAID/Malawi partners can profitably adopt.

Partner: JHPIEGO

Partner Overview: The ACCESS project implemented by JHPIEGO provides technical assistance and support to introduce or scale up proven interventions such as antenatal care (ANC) and IPT of malaria in pregnancy. During FY2007 ACCESS helped scale up the use of IPT by creating and providing job aids, training, and clear policies on malaria in pregnancy for ANC workers. It worked with community health workers to encourage pregnant women to seek care early in their pregnancy and to request treatment for

malaria. It is expected that approximately 300,000 pregnant women will be reached through these activities. By helping scale up IPT and ANC in Malawi, ACCESS is contributing to the PMI goal of ensuring that 85 percent of pregnant women receive IPT. Increasing access to IPT will reduce the incidence of low birth-weight in newborns.

JHPIEGO reports data that contribute to one FY2007 OP Indicator:

- Number of people trained in malaria treatment or prevention with USG funds (SD)

DQA—JHPIEGO

The GH Tech team and Archanjel Chinkunda, USAID/Malawi M&E officer, visited the JHPIEGO offices on October 30, 2007. Abigail A. Kyei, Country Director, and her staff, including the M&E advisor, briefed the team. The GH Tech team reviewed the partner's PMP with particular emphasis on indicators and the evidence used to determine whether they have been achieved. It assessed the linkage between partner and USAID/Malawi PMPs and crosschecked the partner's data collection methodology against the USAID-approved methodology as reflected in the DQA checklists. The GH Tech team crosschecked partner and SO PMP indicators against those in the USAID/Malawi OP; spot-checked the files for base documents and documentation of the evidence demonstrating achievement of the indicator (e.g., training logs, data quality logs, and data tracking sheets). The team also spot-checked operational manuals to confirm the existence of written procedures.

At all levels JHPIEGO personnel are highly qualified, effectively trained, and aggressively supervised in data management. There is an extensive system of crosschecking. Their procedures, with extensive crosschecking and field verification, effectively address the issues of data collection and reporting. Crosschecking effectively addresses any transcription error issues. Procedures for data collection have been consistent since the project began. Data are recorded into data registries and logbooks designed by JHPIEGO. These logbooks are transmitted to JHPIEGO headquarters monthly to be checked by the M&E specialist and other JHPIEGO staff. There is periodic data cleaning to correct transcription errors and account for missing data.

TABLE 10: DQA STANDARDS SUMMARY—JHPIEGO

STANDARD	YES	NO	COMMENT
Validity	X		See text above
Integrity	X		See text above
Precision	X		See text above
Reliability	X		See text above
Timeliness	X		See text above

The data meet DQA and USAID quality standards for management and reporting. USAID/Malawi should periodically visit JHPIEGO, discuss data issues, and crosscheck data collection and reporting procedures and records.

Partner: Management Services for Health (MSH)

Partner Overview: The Rational Pharmaceutical Management Plus (RPM Plus) Program, implemented by MSH, strives to improve the availability of drugs and other health commodities and to promote their appropriate use. RPM Plus will provide technical support to the NMCP toward the adoption of a national ACT drug policy and will assist in planning its implementation. RPM Plus will collaborate with the MOH's Central Medical Stores to ensure appropriate ACT distribution and facilitate the quantification and procurement of these commodities. By helping to ensure that the ACT drug policy is appropriately implemented, RPM Plus activities contribute to the increased availability of this new life-saving drug.

Increasing ACT coverage and use should contribute to a reduction in malaria-related morbidity and mortality in Malawi.

MSH reports data that contribute to four FY2007 OP Indicators:

- Number of people trained in malaria treatment or prevention with USG funds (SD)
- Number of ACTs purchased and distributed with USG support
- Number of improvements to laws, policies, regulations, or guidelines related to improved access to and use of health services drafted with USG support
- Number of USG-assisted SDPs experiencing stock-outs of specific tracer drugs

DQA—MSH

Did not visit RPM Plus or assess data quality.

3.3.1.3 Element: Avian Influenza

Overview: Highly pathogenic avian influenza (AI) is a serious danger to the health and livelihoods of millions of Malawians. Malawi is currently coping with a triple threat of malnutrition/food insecurity, HIV/AIDS, and severely limited government capacity to cope with emergencies, deliver basic social services, or control the flow of goods—including livestock—across its borders. This situation would worsen the impact of any AI outbreak, whether it was confined to birds or spread to humans. The first part of the triple threat is the very large percentage of the population that is malnourished. Even if an AI outbreak were limited to birds, the loss of household poultry flocks would eliminate a major source of protein for the rural poor majority, exacerbating their food insecurity. The second part is that millions of people have compromised immune systems due to HIV/AIDS. In the event of large-scale poultry loss, the resulting malnourishment would further weaken their immune systems. The third part is the GOM severely limited capacity to identify and respond to outbreaks for lack of skilled health workers and personnel trained in AI surveillance. While Malawi is still AI-free, the triple threat makes it extraordinarily vulnerable. It is therefore critically important to support programs aimed at improving the government's capacity to respond to an outbreak, as well as to raise awareness among the population of the threat of AI and how to prevent or mitigate it.

TABLE 11: AVIAN INFLUENZA INDICATORS

PROGRAM ELEMENT INDICATORS: AVIAN INFLUENZA	PRIME PARTNER NAME
Number of USG-provided personal protective equipment (PPE) kits delivered to the requesting country	TBD
Number of people trained in avian and pandemic influenza—related knowledge and skills (SD)	TBD
Number of people who have seen or heard a USG-funded avian or pandemic influenza—related message	TBD
Number of improvements to laws, policies, regulations, or guidelines related to improved access to health services drafted with USG support	TBD

Partner:

Did not visit or assess data quality.

3.3.1.4 Element: Maternal and Child Health

Overview: Malawi has one of the world's highest maternal mortality rates and the GOM has identified maternal mortality as a national priority area. The GOM, together with its development partners, has drafted a Roadmap for Accelerating the Reduction of Maternal and Neonatal Mortality and Morbidity. USAID/Malawi plans to provide support to the Roadmap through selected high-impact, evidence-based interventions that address the greatest causes of maternal and neonatal death. These interventions include emergency obstetrics, treatment of postpartum hemorrhage, and essential newborn care.

The leading causes of morbidity and mortality in children under 5 in Malawi are malaria, pneumonia, and diarrhea. In response to these problems, USAID/Malawi is supporting GOM policy development and training for key interventions. These include (1) integrated management of childhood illnesses and infant/young child feeding, (2) health-system strengthening, (3) capacity building for quality pediatric care at hospitals and health centers, (4) social marketing and community-based distribution of essential child health commodities, and (5) community-based approaches to promote appropriate care and care-seeking behaviors within the home.

The 16 FY2007 OP indicators for maternal and child health (MCH) are shown in Table 12. The primary IPs reporting data that contribute to these indicators are JHPIEGO, Abt Associates, PSI, the U.S. Peace Corps, and Catholic Relief Services (CRS).

TABLE 12: MATERNAL AND CHILD HEATH INDICATORS

PROGRAM ELEMENT INDICATORS: MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH	PRIME PARTNER NAME
1. Number of improvements to laws, polices, regulations or guidelines related to improved access to and use of health services drafted with USG support	JHPIEGO, a nonprofit affiliate of Johns Hopkins University
2. Number of postpartum/newborn visits within 3 days of birth in USG-assisted programs	JHPIEGO
3. Number of cases of child pneumonia treated with antibiotics by trained facility or community health workers in USG-supported programs	
4. Liters of drinking water disinfected with USG-supported point-of-use treatment products	Abt Associates, Inc.; PSI
5. Number of cases of child diarrhea treated by USAID-assisted programs	PSI
6. Number of ANC visits by skilled providers from USG-assisted facilities	JHPIEGO
7. Number of health facilities rehabilitated	U.S. Peace Corps
8. Number of people trained in maternal or newborn health through USG-supported programs (SD)	JHPIEGO
9. Number of people trained in child health care and child nutrition through USG-supported health area programs (SD)	CRS
10. Number of women giving birth who received active management of the third stage of labor (AMSTL) through USG-supported programs	JHPIEGO
11. Number of newborns receiving essential newborn care through USG-supported programs	JHPIEGO
12.Number of children reached by USG-supported nutrition programs	CRS
13. Number of children under 5 provided with oral hydration therapies (OHTs)	U.S. Peace Corps
14. Number of households accessing water sources constructed using USG assistance	U.S. Peace Corps

TABLE 12: MATERNAL AND CHILD HEATH INDICATORS	
PROGRAM ELEMENT INDICATORS: MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH	PRIME PARTNER NAME
15. Number of latrines constructed and households having access to them	U.S. Peace Corps
16. Number of mothers provided with information on nutrition and diarrheal and other associated illnesses	U.S. Peace Corps

Partner: JHPIEGO

Partner Overview: JHPIEGO, in collaboration with other partners, implements ACCESS, which is a continuing centrally funded program that provides global leadership and improved maternal and neonatal health (MNH) services. In FY2007 USAID/Malawi will use this mechanism to assist the MOH in the implementation of the Roadmap. MOH developed the Roadmap in collaboration with development partners to accelerate the reduction in maternal and neonatal mortality and morbidity.

During FY2007, ACCESS will expand high-impact, evidence-based interventions in Malawi that address the greatest causes of maternal and neonatal death. This includes scaling up facility-based performance and quality improvement processes to ensure that providers deliver essential obstetric and newborn care according to appropriate standards, with an emphasis on preventing postpartum hemorrhage and on the proper care of low birth-weight and premature infants. Technical assistance will also strengthen preservice education, raise community awareness of the need for skilled attendance at births, and promote clean delivery through expansion of facility-based infection prevention programs.

JHPIEGO reports data that contribute to six FY2007 OP Indicators:

- Number of improvements to laws, policies, regulations, or guidelines related to improved access to and use of health services drafted with USG support
- Number of postpartum/newborn visits within 3 days of birth in USG-assisted programs
- Number of women giving birth who received AMSTL through USG-supported programs
- Number of people trained in maternal or newborn health through USG-supported programs (SD)
- Number of newborns receiving essential newborn care through USG-supported programs

DQA—JHPIEGO

The GH Tech team and Archanjel Chinkunda, USAID/Malawi M&E officer, visited the JHPIEGO offices on October 30, 2007. Abigail A. Kyei, Country Director, and her staff, including the M&E advisor, briefed the team. The team reviewed the partner's PMP with particular emphasis on indicators and the evidence used to determine whether they have been achieved. The team assessed the linkage between partner and USAID/Malawi PMPs and crosschecked the data collection methodology against USAID-approved methodology as reflected in the DQA checklists. The team also crosschecked partner and SO PMP indicators against indicators in the USAID/Malawi OP and spot-checked files for base documents and documentation of evidence demonstrating achievement of the indicator (e.g., training logs, data quality logs, and data tracking sheets). The team also spot-checked operational manuals to confirm the existence of written procedures.

At all levels JHPIEGO personnel are highly qualified, effectively trained, and aggressively supervised in data management. There is an extensive system of crosschecking. Their procedures, with extensive crosschecking and field verification, effectively address issues of data collection and reporting. Crosschecking effectively addresses any transcription error issues. Procedures for data collection have been consistent since the project began. Data are recorded into data registries and logbooks designed by JHPIEGO that are transmitted to

JHPIEGO monthly for checking by the M&E specialist and other JHPIEGO staff. There is periodic data cleaning to correct transcription errors and account for missing data.

TABLE 13: DQA STANDARDS SUMMARY—JHPIEGO			
STANDARD	YES	NO	COMMENT
Validity	X		See text above
Integrity	X		See text above
Precision	X		See text above
Reliability	X		See text above
Timeliness	X		See text above

The data meet DQA and USAID quality standards for management and reporting. USAID/Malawi should periodically visit JHPIEGO to discuss data issues and crosscheck data collection and reporting procedures and records.

Partner: ABT Associates

Partner Overview: Under a subcontract between Abt Associates and PSI, PSI/Malawi is implementing a two-year intervention to continue and expand the WaterGuard Point-of-Use (POU) water-treatment social-marketing program. The short-term POUZN funding supplements and complements longer-term Child Survival Health Grant Program funding for PSI/Malawi's Integrated Diarrhea Prevention Program.

The goal of the POU water treatment project in Malawi is to reduce diarrheal disease mortality and morbidity in children under 5 by increasing consistent and appropriate use of POU water treatment products by primary caregivers. PSI/Malawi plans to achieve this goal through a combination of commercial marketing techniques and public health approaches to communications that address the factors determining a person's actions: opportunity, ability, and motivation to adopt healthy behavior. Community outreach, education, and distribution conducted with nongovernmental organization (NGO) partners and health workers will enable the project to focus on rural areas with populations that are particularly vulnerable to acute diarrheal disease and face the greatest challenges with regard to water quality.

ABT Associates reports data that contribute to one FY2007 OP Indicator:

- Liters of drinking water disinfected with USG-supported point-of-use treatment products

DQA—ABT Associates

Abt Associates is implementing this component through PSI. The GH Tech team, Archanjel Chinkunda, USAID/Malawi M&E officer, and Humphreys Shumba, CTO, on November 5, 2007 visited the PSI offices, where John Justino, Resident Director; Alfred Zulu, Director of Administration; Michael Kainga, Internal Auditor; and Andrew Miller, Director of Communications, briefed us on the PSI program and performance management practices. The team reviewed PSI's PMP with particular emphasis on indicators and the evidence used to determine whether they have been achieved and assessed the linkage between PSI and USAID/Malawi PMPs. The team crosschecked PSI's data collection methodology against USAID-approved methodology as reflected in the DQA checklists, and crosschecked PSI and SO PMP indicators against those in the USAID/Malawi OP. The team spot-checked PSI files for base documents and documentation of the evidence demonstrating achievement of the indicator (e.g., sales records, warehouse stocking levels, and sales representative reports). The team also spot-checked approximately 30 shops in Blantyre, Zomba, and rural marketing centers to see if one could buy condoms, ORS, WaterGuard, and ITNs. Condoms, ORS and WaterGuard were available in almost all the shops. The larger shops, approximately one in ten, had the ITNs. The team spot-checked operational manuals to confirm the existence of written procedures.

The indicators accurately measure the effectiveness of the PSI sales program in all aspects of health that PSI is addressing. At all levels PSI personnel are highly qualified, effectively trained, and aggressively supervised. There is an extensive system of crosschecking. There is a finance penalty for persons committing errors in recording data**.** PSI has extensive experience in social marketing and is well aware of the difficulties in collecting accurate data. Its procedures, with extensive crosschecking and field verification, effectively address these issues. Crosschecking effectively addresses any transcription error issues. Procedures for data collection have been consistent since the project began.

TABLE 14: DQA STANDARDS SUMMARY—ABT ASSOCIATES			
STANDARD	YES	NO	COMMENT
Validity	X		See text above
Integrity	X		See text above
Precision	X		See text above
Reliability	X		See text above
Timeliness	X		See text above

Partner: PSI

Partner Overview: Under a subcontract between Abt Associates and PSI, PSI/Malawi is implementing a two-year intervention to continue and expand the WaterGuard POU water-treatment social-marketing program in Malawi. The short-term POUZN funding supplements and complements longer-term Child Survival Health Grant Program funding for PSI/Malawi's Integrated Diarrhea Prevention Program.

The goal of the POU water treatment project in Malawi is to reduce diarrheal disease mortality and morbidity in children under 5 by increasing consistent and appropriate use of POU water treatment products by primary caregivers. PSI/Malawi plans to achieve this goal through a combination of commercial marketing techniques and public health approaches to communications that address the factors determining a person's actions: opportunity, ability, and motivation to adopt healthy behavior. Community outreach, education, and distribution conducted with NGO partners and health workers will enable the project to focus on rural areas with populations that are particularly vulnerable to acute diarrheal disease and face the greatest challenges with regard to water quality.

PSI reports data that contribute to two FY2007 OP Indicators:

- Liters of drinking water disinfected with USG-supported POU treatment products
- Number of cases of child diarrhea treated by USAID-assisted programs

DQA—PSI

See above: ABT Associates

Partner: U.S. Peace Corps

Partner Overview: The U.S. Peace Corps (USPC) Small Project Assistance Program (SPA) began in FY2006 and will continue until FY2011 through the current Participating Agency Partnership Agreement (PAPA). Funding for the SPA program comes from contributing USAID Missions. Specifically, Missions provide funding to DCHA/PVC-ASHA, which incorporates these funds into the PAPA. The current PAPA established a five-year mechanism through which the USPC will assist USAID in carrying out the SPA program, which consists of small-scale projects initiated by USPC volunteers in collaboration with host-country and community counterparts, NGOs, and community organizations to support sustainable, grassroots community development through grants, capacity building and other forms of collaboration. SPA

in Malawi will provide nutritional information promoting breast-feeding and on child growth and maternal malnutrition. It will also respond to diarrheal and related illnesses in children under 5, support improved sanitation and water access at the household level, and help to rehabilitate health centers, particularly in rural areas.

USPC reports data that contribute to five FY2007 OP Indicators:

- Number of health facilities rehabilitated
- Number of children under 5 years provided with OHTs
- Number of households accessing water sources constructed using USG assistance
- Numbers of latrines constructed and households having access to them
- Number of mothers provided with information on nutrition and diarrheal and associated illnesses

DQA—U.S. Peace Corps

Did not visit or assess data quality

Partner: Catholic Relief Services

Partner Overview: I-LIFE is a current award implemented by CRS and six subpartners: Africare, CARE, Emmanuel International, Save the Children U.S., the Salvation Army, and World Vision. I-LIFE provides each beneficiary household with a holistic package of services that reduce food insecurity. The MCH component targets children under 5 with the expected result of protecting and enhancing their nutritional status. Growth monitoring (GM) sessions are held monthly in coordination with government health workers; I-LIFE provides scales and record books and trains the volunteers who conduct the sessions. GM sessions disseminate messages on health, HIV/AIDS, village savings and loans groups, improved agricultural practices, etc. I-LIFE volunteers refer severely underweight children to government health facilities; the moderately underweight are referred to the program's PD/Hearth component. During Hearth sessions, mothers cook together and feed their children while trained volunteers share information on nutrition, food preparation, health, and hygiene. Volunteers work with I-LIFE staff to facilitate participation in other program activities, such as home gardening.

CRS reports data that contribute to two FY2007 OP Indicators:

- Number of people trained in child health care and child nutrition through USG-supported health area programs (SD)
- Number of children reached by USG-supported nutrition programs

DQA—Catholic Relief Services

The GH Tech team, Archanjel Chinkunda, USAID/Malawi M&E officer, and Patricia Ziwa, CTO, visited the I-LIFE program offices. Scott McNiven, Director, Program Management Unit (PMU); Cristina Hanson, PMU; Dr. T.D. Jose, M&E Manager, PMU; Fidelis Sindani, PMU; Bena Musembi, PMU; Dziko Chatata, CARE; and Alisha Myers, CRS, briefed the GH Tech team, giving them an overview of the I-LIFE program and its performance management practices. The team reviewed the partner PMP with particular emphasis on the indicators and the evidence used to determine whether they have been achieved and assessed the linkage between partner and USAID/Malawi PMPs. The team also crosschecked the data collection methodology against the USAID-approved methodology as reflected in the DQA checklists, and crosschecked partner and SO PMP indicators against those in the USAID/Malawi OP. The team also spot-checked the files for base documents and documentation of the evidence demonstrating achievement of the indicator (e.g., subpartner data entry sheets for surveys conducted by I-LIFE). The team also spot-checked operational manuals to confirm the existence of written procedures.

The I-LIFE program consists of three elements: agriculture sector productivity, MCH, and social assistance. The seven NGO partners comprising the I-LIFE consortium implement the program. Each implements all three elements using all nine indicators to measure their progress. Each indicator follows the same core procedures in obtaining the performance data.

Each of the seven NGOs has an M&E officer responsible for supervising data collection, all of whom are stationed in the operational area. Data originate at the community level and are transferred monthly to the NGO M&E officer, who reviews the information and resolves potential errors. The NGOs prepare quarterly reports for I-LIFE headquarters, where the data are again reviewed and any remaining errors resolved. Members of the I-LIFE PMU make monthly site visits to each of the seven operational areas. The M&E also officers meet monthly to discuss issues and resolve problems.

Transcription errors exist at each level but seem to be within about a 5 percent margin of error, which is acceptable for this program and environment. The basic data management processes have been consistent since the activity began. However, the consortium has consistently attempted to improve its processes, so some changes have occurred. For example, to avoid double counting, I-LIFE is working at providing separate ID numbers to households and individuals**.**

I-LIFE actively searches out double counting but is aware that, in a program of this size and character, some is inevitable. Establishing both household and individual ID numbers is an attempt to reduce the problem. Data are reviewed at each level and missing elements detected. I-LIFE makes an aggressive effort to fill in any blanks.

TABLE 15: DQA STANDARDS SUMMARY—CATHOLIC RELIEF SERVICES

STANDARD	YES	NO	COMMENT
Validity	X		See text above
Integrity	X		See text above
Precision	X		See text above
Reliability	X		See text above
Timeliness	X		See text above

The data are of excellent quality and meet USAID standards for both program management and reporting. However, continued management involvement with greater field visits to operational sites is recommended. A dialogue between I-LIFE and USAID on impact indicators would be useful. I-LIFE has such indicators readily available and regularly uses them in managing its programs.

Partner: Management Sciences for Health—MSH Project/Basics

The GH Tech team, Archanjel Chinkunda, USAID/Malawi M&E officer, and Catherine Chiphazi, CTO, visited the MSH office (BASICS), where Rudi Thetard, Chief of Party, briefed them. MSH's project ended in September 2007 and was the subject of a final evaluation conducted by GH Tech. (See evaluation for review of MSH Project M&E system.) BASICS currently uses assistant statisticians in its implementation districts. BASICS told the GH Tech team that this works well in small districts but is problematic in large districts. There is some follow-up of errors found in crosschecking the data, but BASICS reported that there is a need for more active spot-checking. The project is facing some difficulty in getting MOH staff to adopt data collection project instruments and tools even though the MOH requires their use. There has been no formal examination of transcription errors. Double counting is not considered a problem.

The GH Team recommends that USAID/Malawi pay particular attention of the development of data collection and reporting efforts of the BASICS project as systems and procedures transition from the MSH Project to the new BASICS project. A follow-up DQA in about six months would be useful.

3.3.1.5 Element: Family Planning and Reproductive Health

Program Overview: Malawi's high fertility rate (6.0) continues to undermine poverty reduction efforts, contributes to high maternal and infant mortality, and exacerbates the AIDS-related orphan problem. If Malawi is to reduce poverty and improve the nutritional status of its population, contraceptive prevalence must continue to increase.

USAID's efforts complement the national health SWAp and contribute to reductions in fertility, support MOH programs, and improve contraceptive choice. Assistance to the MOH will provide high-quality, sustainable reproductive health (RH) services that meet national needs through (1) contraceptive procurement; (2) expanding voluntary, quality family planning (FP) services within health facilities and through outreach and community-based distribution of contraceptives; (3) improving access to FP services through public information and enhanced provider skills; (4) promoting an enabling environment for FP/RH; (5) strengthening health commodities logistics management to ensure that contraceptives and essential drugs are available at all SDPs; (6) continuing to support performance and quality improvement in infection prevention and RH; (7) provision of cervical cancer prevention services in targeted districts, and (8) expanding post-abortion care.

PEPFAR will be integrated into USG RH health strategy and programs.

Table 16 below lists the eight FY2007 OP Indicators for FP/RH. IPs reporting data that contribute to these indicators are Adventist Health Services (AHS), JHPIEGO, Central Contraceptive Procurement, and John Snow, Inc. (JSI).

TABLE 16: FAMILY PLANNING AND REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH INDICATORS

PROGRAM ELEMENT INDICATORS: FAMILY PLANNING AND REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH	PRIME PARTNER NAME
1. Couple-years of protection (CYP) in USG-supported programs	Central Contraceptive Procurement; JSI
2. Number of people trained in FP/RH with USG funds (SD)	JHPIEGO, a nonprofit affiliate of Johns Hopkins University
3. Number of counseling visits for FP/RH as a result of USG assistance (SD)	JHPIEGO; JSI
4. Number of people that have seen or heard a specific USG-supported FP/RH message	
5. Number of policies or guidelines developed or changed with USG assistance to improve access to and use of FP/RH services	
6. Number of new approaches successfully introduced through USG-supported programs	JSI
7. Number of USG-assisted SDPs providing FP counseling or services	JHPIEGO
8. Number of SDPs reporting stock-outs of any contraceptive commodity offered by the SDP at any time during the reporting period	Central Contraceptive Procurement; JSI

Partner: JHPIEGO

Partner Overview: Complications from spontaneous and induced abortions are a major cause of maternal death in Malawi, especially among young mothers. Through existing USAID FP/RH programs, JHPIEGO has introduced post-abortion care (PAC) in all district and central hospitals. PAC services include emergency treatment of incomplete abortions and potentially life-threatening complications, as well as provision of FP counseling and services.

USAID is using this new centrally funded mechanism to accelerate the reduction of maternal mortality due to abortion-related complications as well as improve MNH. With FY2007 funding, ACCESS will strengthen existing PAC services and promote recognition and treatment of obstetric complications by expanding PAC services from the current 55 sites to 100 sites at community hospitals and health centers. JHPIEGO also plans a major effort to improve provider attitudes, especially toward youth. Key interventions will be in service delivery and communication.

JHPIEGO reports data that contribute to four FY2007 OP Indicators:

- Number of people trained in FP/RH with USG funds (SD)
- Number of counseling visits for FP/RH as a result of USG assistance (SD)
- Number of policies or guidelines developed or changed with USG assistance to improve access to and use of FP/RH services
- Number of USG-assisted SDPs providing FP counseling or services

DQA—JHPIEGO

The GH Tech team and Archanjel Chinkunda, USAID/Malawi M&E officer, visited the JHPIEGO offices on October 30, 2007. Abigail A. Kyei, Country Director, and her staff, including the M&E advisor, briefed the team. The team reviewed JHPIEGO's PMP with particular emphasis on indicators and the evidence used to determine whether they have been achieved. It assessed the linkage between partner and USAID/Malawi PMPs and crosschecked partner data collection methodology against USAID-approved methodology as reflected in the DQA checklists. The team also crosschecked partner and SO PMP indicators against those in the USAID/Malawi OP. It spot-checked the partner's files for base documents and documentation of the evidence demonstrating achievement of the indicator (e.g., training logs, data quality logs, and data tracking sheets), and spot-checked operational manuals to confirm the existence of written procedures.

At all levels JHPIEGO personnel are highly qualified, effectively trained, and aggressively supervised in data management. There is an extensive system of crosschecking. Their procedures, with extensive crosschecking and field verification, effectively address the issues of data collection and reporting. Crosschecking also effectively addresses any transcription error issues. Procedures for data collection have been consistent since the project began. Data are recorded into data registries and logbooks designed by JHPIEGO. Field personnel transmit these logbooks to JHPIEGO monthly for the M&E specialist and other JHPIEGO staff to check. There is periodic data cleaning to correct transcription errors and account for missing data.

TABLE 17: DQA STANDARDS SUMMARY—JHPIEGO

STANDARD	YES	NO	COMMENT
Validity	X		See text above
Integrity	X		See text above
Precision	X		See text above
Reliability	X		See text above
Timeliness	X		See text above

The data meet DQA and USAID quality standards for management and reporting. USAID/Malawi should periodically visit JHPIEGO, discuss data issues, and crosscheck data collection and reporting procedures and records.

Partner: Central Contraceptive Procurement

Partner Overview: This is an ongoing activity for procurement of contraceptives for the GOM. The contraceptives procured are Norplant, oral contraceptives, and intrauterine contraceptive devices (IUCD). This activity helps to increase the availability of supplies for the FP program and helps increase the contraceptive prevalence rate, thereby reducing unwanted and unplanned pregnancies among women of childbearing age and reducing total fertility.

Central Contraceptive Procurement reports data that contribute to two FY2007 OP Indicators:

- Couple-years of protection (CYP) in USG-supported programs
- Number of SDPs reporting stock-outs of any contraceptive commodity offered by the SDP at any time during the reporting period

DQA—Central Contraceptive Procurement

This is a centrally funded project whose data were not reviewed for this DQA

Partner: John Snow, Inc. (JSI)

Partner Overview: This activity is a follow-on project to the JSI DELIVER I project that helped to design, develop, and operate reliable and sustainable supply systems for a range of affordable, quality essential health commodities to clients in country programs. DELIVER II's role will be to assist the MOH and its partners in implementing a streamlined distribution system that links the whole supply chain from the central level down to the point of service. Long-term assistance will focus on policy change and implementation of agreed-upon work plans. Short-term assistance will focus on specific activities as outlined in the country strategy and evaluation plan document.

JSI will strengthen the logistics system, build human capacity in logistics management, and improve resource mobilization and coordination for commodity security. These activities will improve the availability of essential health commodities, including contraceptives. Intended outcomes are improved availability of essential commodities and improved accessibility of information on stocks on hand and quantities of essential commodities dispensed to users.

JSI reports data that contribute to four FY2007 OP Indicators:

- CYP in USG-supported programs
- Number of new approaches successfully introduced through USG-supported programs
- Number of SDPs reporting stock-outs of any contraceptive commodity offered by the SDP at any time during the reporting period
- Number of participants trained in logistics management

DQA—JSI

The GH Tech team, Patrick Wesner, USAID/Malawi Program Officer, and Catherine Berkenshire-Scott, Health Team Strategic Information Liaison Advisor, visited the JSI DELIVER II Project located at the MOH Central Medical Stores. Jayne Waweru, Country Director, and Evance Moyo and Elias Mwalabu, both Assistant Logistic Management Information Associates, briefed the team. JSI showed a PowerPoint presentation of its Logistics Management Information System (LMIS). The system manages information at the facility, district, zone, and central levels. There are three sets of LMIS records: stock keeping records, transaction records, and consumption records. Community clinics report to health centers; other facilities report to health centers or district hospitals, whichever is closer; district hospitals report to regional medical stores (RMS); central and mental hospitals report to RMS; and RMSs reports to the Central Medical Store.

LMIS monitoring and supervision occurs at several levels. Desk monitoring uses copies of data collected or submitted on a quarterly basis. Supervision visits address issues of concern. Supervision occurs at three levels: district pharmacy technicians are checked monthly, zonal officers (five zones) quarterly, and the Central Office, MOH Health Technical Support Services (Pharmaceutical) (HTSS), and DELIVER quarterly. The GH Tech team spot-checked the supervisory checklists for drug stores and pharmacies and the monthly MIS report. The team also reviewed a copy of the *Malawi Health Commodities Logistics Management System Standard Operating Procedure Manual*, which covers collecting and managing data. The team also spot-checked training records.

This is a transition year between DELIVER I and DELIVER II. Thus, data reported for the FY2007 OP are a combination of data from both. The JSI staff also indicated that one indicator (**number of SDPs reporting stock-outs of any contraceptive commodity offered by the SDP at any time during the reporting period)** was incorrect for two reasons: in most cases, the data were not recorded, and when the data are recorded, the stock outage might have been re-supplied. That is, what is being recorded is "Is there a stock outage of a given commodity?" rather than "Has there been a stock outage during the past month?" Supervisory meetings either did not detect the errors, or if they did, did not correct them.

TABLE 18: DQA STANDARDS SUMMARY—JSI

STANDARD	YES	NO	COMMENT
Validity	X		Note the issues mentioned in the text about the aggregation of DELIVER I and DELIVER II data. The stock outage indicator is an exception and is not valid for the reason stated.
Integrity	X		Note the issues about the aggregation of DELIVER I and DELIVER II data. The stock outage indicator is an exception for the reason stated.
Precision	X		Note the data issues above about the aggregation of DELIVER I and DELIVER II data. The stock outage indicator is an exception and is not precise.
Reliability	X		Note the data issues above about the aggregation of DELIVER I and DELIVER II data. The stock outage indicator is an exception and is not reliable.
Timeliness	X		

DELIVER II has an excellent Logistic Management Information System that DELIVER I proved produces valid and reliable data. The GH Tech team recommends that the data issues noted be resolved and that the Mission conduct periodic spot-checks of the LMIS.

Partner: Adventist Health Services (AHS)

Partner Overview: AHS reports data that contribute to seven FY2007 OP Indicators:

- CYP in USG-supported programs
- Number of people trained in FP/RH with USG funds (SD)
- Number of counseling visits for FP/RH as a result of USG assistance (SD)
- Number of people that have seen or heard a specific FP/RH message
- Number of interventions providing services, counseling, or community-based awareness activities intended to reduce rates of gender-based violence
- Number of SDPs providing FP counseling or services

- Number of SDPs that reported stock-outs of any contraceptive commodity offered by the SDP at any point during the period

DQA—Adventist Health Services (AHS)

The GH Tech team, Archanjel Chinkunda, USAID/Malawi M&E officer, and Phyles Kachingwe, the CTO, visited the AHS program. The team was briefed by Florence Chipungu AHS Director; Joseph Mwandira, Project Manager; Peter Kambalametore, FP Coordinator; and Dorothy Gomani, Data Entry Clerk, on the AHS program and its performance management. The team reviewed the AHS PMP with particular emphasis on the indicators and the evidence used to determine whether they were achieved and assessed the linkage between AHS and USAID/Malawi PMPs. The team cross-checked the AHS data collection methodology against the USAID-approved methodology as reflected in the DQA checklists, and crosschecked partner and SO PMP indicators against those in the USAID/Malawi Operational Plan. The team spot-checked the AHS files for base documents and documentation of the evidence demonstrating achievement of indicators, looking, for example, at tally sheets from community-based distribution agents (CBDAs) to verify activity data. The team also spot-checked operations manuals to confirm the existence of written procedures.

The seven indicators accurately measure the scope of the program and its effectiveness in providing basic FP services. Recognizing the difficulties involved in volunteers collecting accurate data, AHS has instituted crosschecking procedures to address those issues, such as specifically checking to see if services provided balances commodities used.

AHS crosschecks transcripts against services and commodities provided. Procedures have been stable since the beginning of the project. AHS reviews data quarterly. Written procedures are in place.

TABLE 19: DQA STANDARDS SUMMARY—ADVENTIST HEALTH SERVICES

STANDARD	YES	NO	COMMENT
Validity	X		See text above
Integrity	X		See text above
Precision	X		See text above
Reliability	X		See text above
Timeliness	X		See text above

The data meet USAID standards for management and reporting. This is a community-based, largely volunteer-implemented program. The GH Tech team estimates the level of error in terms of data collection and transcription at between 5 and 10 percent; AHS believes it is less than 5 percent. For this type of program in this environment, this is acceptable for management and reporting purposes. The GH Tech team recommends frequent field site visits by the CTO.

3.3.1.6 Element: HIV/AIDS and PEPFAR

Overview: In addition to the Malawi FY2007 OP indicators, USAID/Malawi requested the GH Tech team to assess the palliative care indicators of two of the Mission's PEPFAR implementers, FHI (project now closed) and the PACT/Malawi Program (the current implementer). The palliative care indicators assessed are show in Table 20. The GH Tech team notes that the health team conducted a separate DQA of PEPFAR indicator data in response to an earlier PEPFAR data audit by the Regional IG's office.

TABLE 20: PEPFAR PALLIATIVE CARE INDICATORS	
PROGRAM ELEMENT INDICATORS: PALLIATIVE CARE (BASIC)	PRIME PARTNER NAME
1. Number of service outlets providing HIV-related palliative care (including TB/HIV)	FHI; PACT/Malawi Program
2, Number of individuals provided with HIV-related palliative care (including TB/HIV)	FHI; PACT/Malawi Program
3. Number of individuals trained to provide HIV palliative care (including TB/HIV)	FHI;PACT/Malawi Program

Partner: Family Health International (FHI)

The GH Tech team, Patrick Wesner, USAID/Malawi Program Officer, and Catherine Berkenshire-Scott, Strategic Information Liaison Advisor, visited FHI on November 2, 2007. Margaret Kaseje, Country Director; Dafter Khembo, M&E Officer; and Tiwonge Moyo, Program Officer, briefed the team. The FHI Project ended March 31, 2007. The project was implemented through 19 local partners at 20 sites. The Malawi FY2007 OP indicators report covered the period October 1, 2000 to March 31, 2007. Home-based palliative care was implemented using a network of volunteers. FHI M&E staff trained local implementing partners in collecting, recording, and reporting data. The trained local implementing staff then trained home-based care volunteers in data collection. The team crosschecked training attendance reports. There were monthly spot checks of data at the district level. The M&E Officer assessed all data collected. Occasionally the Director would also spot-check data. It appears that for at least the palliative care indicators, FHI responded to the findings of the PEPFAR Data Audit and the Indicator Data reported for the FY2007 Operational Plan meet the DQA standards.

Partner: PACT/Malawi

The GH Tech team and Patrick Wesner, USAID/Malawi Program Officer visited PACT on November 2, 2007. Matthew Tiedemann, Chief of Party; Patrick Phoso, Program Officer, HIV/AIDS; Janet Chime, Senior HIV/AIDS Advisor; and Cecilia Maganga, MER Program Officer briefed the team. The project started in January 2007 but it took about four months to hire and mobilize staff. There are seven local partners, each of which has its own data collection tools, which are causing some problems in aggregating field data. There is currently an effort to standardize forms and data collection tools. PACT has conducted a weeklong workshop in M&E and reporting for its partners. Each partner is responsible for checking data entry and reporting. Partners have computers for data entry. One partner lacks computer skills, and there are plans for computer skills training. There is supervision of data collection at the grass-roots level.

All seven began implementation in April 2007; three of the seven are continuing into FY2008 with new subgrants. PACT has conducted one data validation visit. There are plans for quarterly site visits and an annual DQA. There is also a quarterly desk review of data. PACT is experiencing some problems getting information from some of the partners.

It is suggested that USAID/Malawi make frequent spot-checks of data collection and collection procedures. Special attention should be paid to the standardization of data collection instruments and tools across all the partners.

3.3.2 PROGRAM AREA: EDUCATION

3.3.2.1 Element Basic Education

Overview: USAID/Malawi's Education Portfolio for the next five years responds to Malawi's strategic priorities as stated in the Malawi Growth and Development Strategy, which includes increased public sector investment in education. USAID/Malawi's activities in education support the GOM National Education Sector Plan, which focuses on improving access, equity, quality, and internal efficiency for primary education.

USAID education programs in Malawi focus on (1) improving the quality of primary education through teacher training, promotion of greater parent and community involvement, and the introduction of interactive radio instruction; (2) making education more accessible to children, particularly girls, HIV/AIDS orphans, and other vulnerable children; (3) improving the quality and quantity of data available for policymaking; and (4) integrating HIV/AIDS programming and information throughout the curriculum and school system.

USG activities in education will contribute substantively to improving the quality of primary education and retention of students, promoting effective teaching methodologies, school administration, and parental/community involvement. They also encourage and support disadvantaged children, including girls and orphans, to attend and remain in school.

The two IPs are the American Institute for Research (AIR) and the Academy for Educational Development (AED). Indicators for this subelement are shown in Table 21.

TABLE 21: BASIC EDUCATION INDICATORS

PROGRAM ELEMENT INDICATORS: BASIC EDUCATION	PRIME PARTNER NAME
1. Number of learners enrolled in USG-supported primary schools or equivalent non-school-based settings (SD)	AIR
2. Number of teachers/educators trained with USG support (SD)	AIR
3. Number of host country institutions with improved management information systems as a result of USG assistance	AED
4. Number of host country institutions that have used USG-assisted MIS system information to inform administrative/management decisions	AED
5. Number of people trained in strategic information management with USG assistance	AED

Below are summaries of DQA findings for each partner with respect to the collection, compilation, analysis, and reporting of data for the indicators shown in Table 21. For details of the DQA, see the DQA checklist in Annex C.

Partner: American Institute for Research (AIR)

Partner Overview: The goal of the GOM Primary Curriculum and Assessment Reform (PCAR) program is to improve the quality of primary education by introducing a new curriculum and upgrading the teaching workforce to teach it. The Malawi Teacher Training Activity (MTTA) will work with the Ministry of Education (MOE) to roll out the PCAR in the four districts where MTTA currently works: Mzimba South, Kasungu, Machinga, and Phalombe. MTTA will work with the Malawi Institute for Education (MIE) to support the MOE in improving the quality of education through a cycle of in-service trainings at the zonal, cluster, and school levels. MTTA aims to enrich MIE's PCAR methodologies by employing MTTA's best practices, which include the Mobile Teaching Training Troupe (MTTT) initiative, teacher development conference approaches, decentralized clinical classroom observation, and teacher support systems.

AIR reports data that contribute to two FY2007 OP Indicators:

- Number of learners enrolled in USG-supported primary schools or equivalent non-school-based settings (SD)
- Number of teachers/educators trained with USG support (SD)

DQA—AIR/MTTA

The GH Tech team, Archanjel Chinkunda, USAID/Malawi M&E officer, and Ramsey Sosola, CTO, visited the MTTA project on November 6, 2007. Simon Mawindo Chief of Party; Dr. Hartford Mchazime, Deputy Chief of Party; and Chaplain Katumbi, M&E Officer, briefed the team on the MTTA program and its performance management practices. The GH Tech team reviewed the AIR PMP with particular emphasis on the indicators and the evidence used to determine whether they have been achieved, and team assessed the linkage between the partner USAID/Malawi PMPs. The team cross-checked the data collection methodology against the USAID-approved methodology as reflected in the DQA checklists, and cross-checked partner and SO PMP indicators against those in the USAID/Malawi Operational Plan. The team spot-checked the files for base documents and documentation of the evidence demonstrating achievement of the indicator. For example, the team looked at signed per diem receipts to verify attendance at training courses. The team also spot-checked operations manuals to confirm the existence of written procedures.

Without USAID assistance, this project would not be taking place. The number of students able to read at grade 3 level would not have increased from less than 1 percent to 9.5 percent, and the overall energizing of the educational system in the four districts would not have occurred. MTTA thoroughly trains the enumerators for the project and carefully supervises their work. The enumerators are practicing teachers who are familiar with the schools. MTTA staff review the data as they are collected. Any errors detected are tracked to the source and corrected. All MTTA staff are involved in spot-checking. MTTA is well aware of the methodological and logistical difficulties in collecting data from schools that have not generally kept records.

The M&E officer carefully trains data entry personnel and actively supervises their work. He also reviews all final copies for errors. Data collection issues are discussed in a number of MTTA documents. Data collection procedures have been consistent since the beginning of the project. Techniques for training enumerators and spot-checking have been improved by the lessons of experience. MTTA data collection procedures are fully adequate to meet both managerial and reporting requirements. For example, in spot-checking student achievement performance the GH Tech team was able to track the scores of several students through two complete testing cycles.

The methodology used for the surveys specifically guards against double counting. School data are identified by the specific child and class, so double counting is not a major issue.

TABLE 22A: DQA STANDARDS SUMMARY—AIR/MTTA

STANDARD	YES	NO	COMMENT
Validity	X		See text above
Integrity	X		See text above
Precision	X		See text above
Reliability	X		See text above
Timeliness	X		See text above

The data meet USAID standards for both management and reporting. The GH Tech team recommends that USAID continue to make staff field visits. It would also be useful to bring together, on at least a semi-annual basis, the various educational projects to share experiences and identify potential best practices. It is particularly important to do this before the MTTA project ends in December.

DQA—AIR/PSSP

The GH Tech team; Archanjel Chinkunda, USAID/Malawi M&E officer; and Florence Nkosi, CTO, visited the Primary School Support Program (PSSP), where the Deputy Chief of Party, Cassandra L. Jessee, briefed us on the program and its performance management practices. The team reviewed the partner PMP with

particular emphasis on the indicators and the evidence used to determine whether they have been achieved, and team assessed the linkage between partner and USAID/Malawi PMPs. The team cross-checked the data collection methodology against the USAID-approved methodology as reflected in the DQA checklists, and crosschecked partner and SO PMP indicators against indicators in the USAID/Malawi OP. The team also spot-checked the files for base documents and documentation of the evidence demonstrating achievement of the indicator (e.g., student test scores from various schools and years). The team traced one school through the initial two years of the project. The team spot-checked operations manuals to confirm the existence of written procedures.

The three indicators for which PSSP is responsible give an accurate picture of the range and quality of activities used to improve primary education in Dowa District. Enrollment data come straight from the schools, training data from the specific courses, and parent-teacher association data from project members. All personnel are qualified to provide the data for which they are responsible. Supervision is adequate, and supported by active field visits from PSSP personnel.

PSSP has an active error detection protocol in its software that alerts staff of data that are above or below anticipated norms. PSSP is well aware of the difficulties of collecting accurate data on a school system with limited resources and approximately 148,000 primary school students. There is extensive crosschecking by the M&E staff and the Deputy Chief of Party. Written procedures are in place. The PSSP staff review data at least quarterly.

Data collection is fully adequate for management of the PSSP program. Data are stored on-site in the project data bank and off-site at the Deputy Chief of Party residence. Children are identified by name and school, which substantially reduces the risk of duplication. Extensive crosschecking and close follow up via field site visits significantly reduces this problem. After transcription, only three project staff members have access to the raw data and analytical processes.

TABLE 22B: DQA STANDARDS SUMMARY—AIR/PSSP

STANDARD	YES	NO	COMMENT
Validity	X		See text above
Integrity	X		See text above
Precision	X		See text above
Reliability	X		See text above
Timeliness	X		See text above

Partner: Academy for Educational Development (AED)

Partner Overview: The objective of the AED-implemented Education Management Information System (EMIS) is to institutionalize the MOE's capacity to collect, process, and produce data to support educational decision-making. The EMIS strengthens the data management capacity of headquarters, divisional, and district education offices by providing both the necessary equipment and training in the use of software to support the collection, processing, and production of school census data. AED is responsible for reporting on three performance indicators (see Table 21).

AED reports data that contribute to three FY2007 OP Indicators:

- Number of host country institutions with improved management information systems as a result of USG assistance
- Number of host country institutions that have used USG-assisted MIS system information to inform administrative/management decisions
- Number of people trained in strategic information management with USG assistance

DQA—AED

The DQA team; Archanjel Chinkunda, USAID/Malawi M&E officer; and Ramsey Sosola, CTO, visited the AED EQUIP2 EMIS program in the MOE on October 30, 2007. Fahim Akbar, Education Management and Monitoring Information Systems Advisor, and his team of Chandiwira Nyirenda, Education Planner; Martin Masnche, Senior Education Planner; and Enock Matale, Assistant Statistician, briefed the team on the EQUIP2 program and its performance management practices. The team reviewed the AED PMP with particular emphasis on the indicators and the evidence used to determine whether they have been achieved. The team assessed the linkage between the AED and USAID/Malawi PMPs; crosschecked the data collection methodology against the USAID-approved methodology; and crosschecked AED and SO PMP indicators against those in the USAID/Malawi OP. The team also spot-checked the AED files for base documents and documentation of the evidence demonstrating achievement of the indicator (e.g., signed per diem receipts to verify attendance at training courses), and spot-checked operations manuals to confirm the existence of written procedures.

To address transcription error, senior EQUIP2 staff spot-check from 10 to 20 questionnaires per day. Any errors detected are immediately corrected. EQUIP2 staff state the incident of error is less than 5 percent.

A DQA checklist was prepared on the common indicators that EQUIP2 is responsible for reporting on. Using the checklist as the point of departure, the GH Tech team checked data from the partners for the V-I-P-R-T standards**. Validity** was determined by checking for consistent application of the same criteria, formulas, and procedures at all levels of the process. **Reliability** was checked by determining if the partner used the same data collection methods from year to year; the primary test was spot-checking the basic questionnaire completed by each school in the program. The GH Tech team checked **timeliness** by reviewing quarterly reports to determine the period in which data were reported from field sites to partner and from partner to USAID/Malawi. The team also reviewed EQUIP2 spot-checking procedures to determine if those procedures are adequate to determine **integrity** (see Annex C).

The data collected for OP Report purposes meet the five quality standards of the DQA. Although they do not impact OP Report indicators, there are significant limitations in resources and in skills at the school level that suggest general limitations in data collection Basic record keeping systems are often deficient. There are also limitations on the understanding of statistical data. EQUIP2 has some interesting ideas for overcoming these limitations that USAID should encourage—in particular, using a geographical rather than a statistical approach to presenting data seems promising.

TABLE 23: DQA STANDARDS SUMMARY—AED

STANDARD	YES	NO	COMMENT
Validity	X		See text above
Integrity	X		See text above
Precision	X		See text above
Reliability	X		See text above
Timeliness	X		See text above

During the next data collection cycle, Mission staff should systematically visit several of the zone training sessions to spot check data collection procedures.

3.3.3 PROGRAM AREA: SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC SERVICES AND PROTECTION FOR VULNERABLE POPULATIONS

Overview: The 2006 Malawi Poverty and Vulnerability Study noted that 95 percent of households surveyed reported at least one economic shock in the past five years; most experienced more than one type of shock. Shocks include loss of employment, illness that incapacitates a breadwinner, or unforeseen, costly expenditures due to crop failure or another natural disaster-related property loss. These shocks can push even

the non-poor into poverty. Social assistance programs provide a safety margin to those chronically vulnerable due to HIV/AIDS status, loss of one or both parents, inability to meet basic food needs, or otherwise unable to benefit from economic growth, as well as to those made vulnerable by economic shocks. By the end of FY2008, the USG will have provided food rations and supplementary feeding to more than 8,000 vulnerable households.

3.3.3.1 Element: Social Assistance

Overview: Achievement of sustainable economic growth and development by itself may not automatically translate into improved quality of life for the most vulnerable Malawians. Recent analysis, however, suggests that small increases in expenditure growth can move people out of poverty, while economic shocks can quickly push people into poverty. Thus, social assistance programs are needed to protect those vulnerable populations that may not be able to take advantage of the benefits of economic growth, as well as those that only fall into vulnerability due to periodic economic shocks. These vulnerable groups include the elderly, the chronically sick, orphans and other vulnerable children, malnourished children, lactating mothers, and destitute families.

Several key challenges and constraints have made it difficult to improve the quality of life of the most vulnerable, including a lack of clear focus in implementing cost-effective interventions, especially in the area of preventing and reducing stunting and wasting in children younger than 2; and poor targeting, mainly due to insufficient data about the characteristics, location, challenges, and needs of the vulnerable.

By the end of FY2007, the USG PL480-funded I-LIFE project will have provided food rations and supplementary feeding to more than 8,000 chronically ill or orphans and vulnerable children (OVC) households to meet their basic needs while longer-term solutions are sought.

There is one IP, CRS, that reports indicator data. The indicator for social assistance is shown in Table 24.

TABLE 24: SOCIAL ASSISTANCE INDICATOR

PROGRAM ELEMENT INDICATORS: SOCIAL ASSISTANCE	PRIME PARTNER NAME
Numbers of people benefiting from USG-supported social assistance programming (men, women, food insecure, HIV-affected, female-headed households, and other targeted vulnerable people)	Catholic Relief Services

Partner: Catholic Relief Services (CRS)

Partner Overview: CRS and six subpartners—Africare, CARE, Emmanuel International, Save the Children, the Salvation Army, and World Vision—implement I-LIFE, a continuing Food for Peace Title II award. I-LIFE provides each beneficiary household with a holistic package of services that work together to reduce food insecurity. The Social Assistance element specifically targets vulnerable households caring for OVCs or chronically ill members, with the expected result of protecting and enhancing the nutritional status of this group. Each targeted household receives a monthly ration of 50kg of corn meal, 5kg of pulses, 10kg of soya blend, and 3.65kg of cooking oil. During food distributions, program staff and community volunteers give demonstrations on how to prepare the foodstuffs provided, and messages on HIV/AIDS and other health and nutrition issues. Program staff and home-based care volunteers work closely together to include the targeted households in other I-LIFE development activities, such as village savings and loan groups or gardening. I-LIFE also is a partner in USG/ Malawi PEPFAR.

CRS reports data that contribute to one FY2007 OP indicator:

- Number of people benefiting from USG-supported social assistance programming (men, women, food-insecure, HIV-affected, female-headed households, and other targeted vulnerable people)

DQA—CRS

The GH Tech team; Archanjel Chinkunda, USAID/Malawi M&E officer; Patricia Ziwa, CTO; and Violet Orchardson, Nutritionist visited the I-LIFE program offices on November 2, 2007. Scott McNiven, Chief of Party; Cristina Hanson, PMU; Dr. T.D. Jose, M&E Manager, PMU; Fidelis Sinani, PMU; Bena Musembi, PMU; Dziko Chatata, CARE; and Aliza Myers, PMU briefed the team on the I-LIFE program and its performance management practices. The team reviewed the CRS PMP with particular emphasis on the indicators and the evidence used to determine whether they have been achieved. The team assessed the linkage between the CRS and USAID/Malawi PMPs; crosschecked the data collection methodology against the USAID- approved methodology as reflected in the DQA checklists; and crosschecked partner and SO PMP indicators against those in the USAID/Malawi OP. The team also spot-checked the files for base documents and documentation of the evidence demonstrating achievement of the indicator (e.g., subpartner data entry sheets for surveys conducted by I-LIFE.) The team spot-checked operations manuals to confirm the existence of written procedures.

CRS and its six subpartners each have an M&E officer responsible for supervising data collection. All seven M&E officers are stationed in the operational area. Transcription errors exist at each level but seem to be within approximately a 5 percent margin of error, which is acceptable for this program and environment. Data quality problems are freely discussed with the CTO but generally not discussed in the quarterly and annual reports.

The indicator data are of excellent quality, meeting or exceeding the five DQA standards for both program management and reporting.

TABLE 25: DQA STANDARDS SUMMARY—CRS

STANDARD	YES	NO	COMMENT
Validity	X		See text above
Integrity	X		See text above
Precision	X		See text above
Reliability	X		See text above
Timeliness	X		See text above

3.4 FUNCTIONAL GOAL: PROMOTING ECONOMIC GROWTH AND PROSPERITY

3.4.1 PROGRAM AREA: AGRICULTURE

Overview: In Malawi, agriculture accounts for 38 percent of GDP and 88 percent of export revenues, and employs over 85 percent of the workforce. Yet the country is not food self-sufficient. Most agriculture is of the low-productivity subsistence type, and more than 25 percent of the population cannot meet minimum nutritional needs. Periodic shortfalls in annual crop yields regularly push thousands more households into food insecurity. Agriculture's contribution to economic growth will increase with higher productivity through irrigation, improved technologies, increased access to credit, and diversification of income sources. By the end of FY2008, 296,000 households will have benefited from USAID assistance. The focus is on vulnerable households with potential to improve their situation, including those headed by AIDS orphans and people living with HIV/AIDS.

3.4.1.1 ELEMENT: AGRICULTURE-ENABLING ENVIRONMENT

Overview: After many years of inconsistent policies and haphazard implementation, the GOM has developed an 11-point Agricultural Sector Policy Framework, linked to the Comprehensive African Agricultural Development Program. Within this framework, the USG will support policy analysis to guide investments that within five years should lead to sustainable public-private partnerships to increase

productivity and competitiveness. Specifically, USAID will support two activities with FY2007 resources: the establishment of a node of the regional Strategic Analysis and Knowledge Support System (SAKSS) for policy analysis, and an M&E component of a multi-donor-funded GOM voucher program to subsidize fertilizers and seed for poor farmers, which is designed to stimulate agricultural growth.

There is one IP, the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) reporting indicator data. The indicator for Agriculture-Enabling Environment is shown in Table 26.

TABLE 26: AGRICULTURE-ENABLING ENVIRONMENT INDICATOR

PROGRAM ELEMENT INDICATORS: AGRICULTURE ENABLING ENVIRONMENT	PRIME PARTNER NAME
Number of individuals who have received short-term agricultural-enabling environment training as a result of USG assistance (sex-disaggregated)	International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI)

Partner: International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI)

Partner Overview: The goal of the SAKSS is to improve the quality of the information and analysis to support evidence-based formulation, implementation, and monitoring of strategies, policies, and programs in the agricultural sector. It is designed to add value to other mechanisms used by the government and all the donors. SAKSS supports the Presidential Initiative to End Hunger in Africa; it is now supported by additional donors and by New Partnership for Africa's Development's Comprehensive African Agricultural Development Program (NEPAD/CAADP). SAKSS will pull together information from multiple sources and provide customized economic and financial analyses. These analyses will help to guide the often difficult trade-offs that planners and project managers face when trying to reduce the economic vulnerability of smallholder farmers and increase their productivity and competitiveness. SAKSS will also map investments in individual projects and their indicators to measure against higher-level goals. Training will be provided to build national capacity. Support from additional donors will be encouraged.

IFPRI reports data that contribute to one FY2007 OP indicator:

- Number of individuals who have received short-term agricultural-enabling environment training as a result of USG assistance (sex-disaggregated)

DQA—IFPRI

Did not visit or assess data quality.

3.4.1.2 Element: Agriculture Sector Productivity

Overview: The five-year objective of USAID/Malawi is to increase the productivity and competitiveness of the agricultural sector as the basis for broad-based economic growth, and to increase incomes while significantly reducing chronic food insecurity. USAID will jointly program development assistance and Title II nonemergency food aid to meet clearly defined objectives and to scale up successes based on earlier programs and partnerships. The USG will use FY2007 funding to implement a number of activities, including

- linking vulnerable households, extension workers, and private traders to implement improved practices, including small-scale irrigation, and improved crop varieties, scaling up the transfer of best practices to reach approximately 31,000 households, thus increasing the productive safety net
- improving services and input-supply systems as well as the management of milk bulking groups, which directly benefit more than 4,500 households and model commercial enterprises for smallholders

- working with regionally and centrally funded USAID programs to promote improved seed systems; improve agricultural practices, including conservation agriculture; and improve marketing and agro-processing enterprises through public-private sector partnerships
- using the USAID Development Credit Authority (DCA) loan guarantee mechanism to simulate investments in agricultural inputs, agro-processing, and value-added products

Four IPs have undertaken activities under this element: Project Concern International (PCI), CRS, Land O'Lakes, and Standard Bank Malawi. Indicators for this element are shown in Table 27.

TABLE 27: AGRICULTURE SECTOR PRODUCTIVITY INDICATORS

PROGRAM ELEMENT INDICATORS: AGRICULTURE SECTOR PRODUCTIVITY	PRIME PARTNER NAME
1. Number of public-private partnerships formed as a result of USG assistance	PCI
2. Number of individuals who have received USG-supported short-term agricultural sector productivity training (SD)	CRS; Land O' Lakes; PCI
3. Amount of private financing mobilized with a DCA guarantee	Standard Bank Malawi
4. Number of new technologies or management practices made available for transfer as a result of USG assistance	CRS; PCI
5. Number of vulnerable households benefiting directly from USG assistance	CRS
6. Number of rural households benefiting directly from USG assistance	CRS; Land O' Lakes
7. Number of producer organizations, water users associations, trade and business associations, and community- based organizations receiving USG assistance	CRS; Land O' Lakes; PCI
8. Number of agriculture-related firms benefiting directly from USG-supported interventions	Land O' Lakes; PCI; Standard Bank Malawi

Below are summaries of DQA findings for each partner with respect to the collection, compilation, analysis, and reporting of data for the eight indicators.

Partner: Project Concern International (PCI)

Partner Overview: PCI reports data that contribute to five FY2007 OP indicators:

- Number of public-private partnerships formed as a result of USG assistance
- Number of individuals who have received USG-supported short-term agricultural sector productivity training (SD)
- Number of new technologies or management practices made available for transfer as a result of USG assistance

- Number of producer organizations, water users associations, trade and business associations, and community-based organizations (CBOs) receiving USG assistance
- Number of agriculture-related firms benefiting directly from USG-supported interventions

DQA—PCI

Did not visit or assess data quality.

Partner: Catholic Relief Serives (CRS)

Partner Overview: CRS and six subpartners—Africare, CARE, Emmanuel International, Save the Children, the Salvation Army, and World Vision—implement I-LIFE. I-LIFE provides each beneficiary household with a holistic package of services that work together to reduce food insecurity. Program activities include training in production, natural resource management, marketing, and savings; seed distributions and seed fairs; and asset generation through Food for Work activities, including market roads and irrigation.

CRS reports data that contribute to five FY2007 OP indicators:

- Number of individuals who have received USG-supported short-term agricultural sector productivity training (SD)
- Number of new technologies or management practices made available for transfer as a result of USG assistance
- Number of vulnerable households benefiting directly from USG assistance
- Number of rural households benefiting directly from USG assistance
- Number of producer organizations, water users associations, trade and business associations, and CBOs receiving USG assistance

DQA—CRS

The GH Tech team; Archanjel Chinkunda, USAID/Malawi M&E officer; Patricia Ziwa, CTO; and Violet Orchardson, Nutritionist, visited the I-LIFE program offices on November 2, 2007. Scott McNiven, Chief of Party; Cristina Hanson, PMU; Dr. T.D. Jose, M&E Manager, PMU; Fidelis Sinani, PMU; Bena Musembi, PMU; Dziko Chaata, CARE/Malawi; and Aliza Myers, PMU briefed the team on the I-LIFE program and its performance management practices. The team reviewed the CRS PMP with particular emphasis on the indicators and the evidence used to determine whether they have been achieved. The team assessed the linkage between CRS and USAID/Malawi PMPs. The team cross-checked the data collection methodology against the USAID-approved methodology as reflected in the DQA checklists, and crosschecked partner and SO PMP indicators against those in the USAID/Malawi OP. The team also spot-checked the CRS files for base documents and documentation of the evidence demonstrating achievement of the indicator (e.g., subpartner data entry sheets for surveys conducted by I-LIFE). The team also spot-checked operations manuals to confirm the existence of written procedures.

CRS and its six subpartners each have a specific M&E officer responsible for supervising data collection. All seven M&E officers are stationed in the operational area. Transcription errors exist at each level but seem to be within approximately a 5 percent margin of error, which is acceptable for this program and environment. Data quality problems are freely discussed with the CTO but generally not discussed in quarterly and annual reports.

The indicator data are of excellent quality, meeting or exceeding the five DQA standards for both program management and reporting.

TABLE 28: DQA STANDARDS SUMMARY—CRS			
STANDARD	YES	NO	COMMENT
Validity	X		See text above
Integrity	X		See text above
Precision	X		See text above
Reliability	X		See text above
Timeliness	X		See text above

Partner: Land O'lakes

Partner Overview: Land O'Lakes leads the Malawi Dairy Development Alliance (MDDA), a Global Development Alliance (GDA) with a goal of increasing the incomes of rural dairy farmers in Malawi. GDA will achieve this goal by

- increasing dairy production and productivity in Northern and Central Region milk sheds to achieve the economies of scale in milk production required to meet consumer demand and ensure the commercial viability of farmer-owned milk bulking groups (MBGs), private diary processors, and input supply and service providers
- ensuring the commercial sustainability of farmers, producer groups, and processors to professionally and profitably manage their farms and businesses by building the capacity of associations, public institutions, and private input suppliers and service providers to provide essential business development services

By the end of FY2008, more than 4,500 rural households and 51 agriculture-related firms will have benefited from USG interventions.

Data from Land O'Lakes contribute to four OP indicators:

- Number of individuals who have received USG-supported short-term agricultural sector productivity training (SD)
- Number of rural households benefiting directly from USG assistance
- Number of producer organizations, water users associations, trade and business associations, and CBOs receiving USG assistance
- Number of agriculture-related firms benefiting directly from USG-supported interventions

DQA—Land O'lakes

The GH Tech team and Emmie Kamanga, USAID/Malawi Program Budget Specialist, visited the Land O'Lakes offices. Gretchen Villegas, MDDA Country Manager, and Peter G. Ngoma, M&E Specialist briefed the team. The GH Tech team reviewed the partner's PMP with particular emphasis on the indicators and the evidence used to determine whether they have been achieved, and assessed the linkage between partner and USAID/Malawi PMPs. As explained in the Land O'Lakes FY2007 OP Implementing Mechanism Indicator Result Template, during FY2007 there was a shift in program implementation with the signing of a new agreement with USAID. Land O'Lakes began implementing the project using subgrant mechanisms instead of indirect funding mechanisms to beneficiaries. However, because Land O'Lakes is still working with the same target groups, it will still be able to report on the OP indicators. The team examined and crosschecked the data collection methodology against the USAID-approved methodology as reflected in the DQA checklists, and crosschecked partner and SO PMP indicators against indicators in the USAID/Malawi

Operational Plan. The team also spot-checked the company's files for base documents and documentation of the evidence demonstrating achievement of the indicator. For example, the GH Tech team was shown the record book maintained by MBGs and by individual diary farmers, and was given a copy of the *Monitoring and Evaluation of Diary Projects in Malawi Training of Trainers Manual* used in training subpartners in data collection, compilation, and analysis and reporting. The team also examined the manual Land O'Lakes uses to train farmers, which contains a section on record keeping and use. The team also spot-checked operations manuals to confirm the existence of written procedures, and visited the Chitsanzo MBG to verify data collection and handling procedures and supervision.

TABLE 29: DQA STANDARDS SUMMARY—LAND O'LAKES

STANDARD	YES	NO	COMMENT
Validity	X		See text above
Integrity	X		See text above
Precision	X		See text above
Reliability	X		See text above
Timeliness	X		See text above

Partner: Standard Bank Malawi

Partner Overview: Data from Standard Bank Malawi contribute to two OP indicators:

- Amount of private financing mobilized with a DCA guarantee
- Number of agriculture-related firms benefiting directly from USG-supported interventions

DQA—Standard Bank Malawi

Did not visit or assess data quality.

Partner: Washington State University/Total Landcare

Partner Overview: Washington State University contributes to seven OP indicators:

- Growth in rural income as a result of USG assistance
- Number of new technologies or management practices under field testing as a result of USG assistance
- Number of new technologies or management practices made available for transfer as a result of USG assistance
- Number of additional hectares under improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance
- Number of rural households benefiting directly from USG interventions
- Number of producers' organizations, water users associations, trade and business associations, and CBOs assisted as a result of USG interventions (sex-disaggregated)
- Number of public-private partnerships formed as a result of USG assistance

DQA—Washington State University (WSU)/Total Landcare (TLC)

The GH Tech team, Archanjel Chinkunda, USAID/Malawi M&E officer, and Patricia Ziwa, CTO visited the Washington State program office. Trent Bunderson, Regional Director, and Zwidew Jere, TLC Director, presented an overview of the program and outlined the Washington State performance management practices. The team reviewed the PMP with particular emphasis on the indicators and the evidence used to determine whether they have been achieved, and assessed linkage between the WSU and USAID/Malawi PMPs. The team cross-checked the WSU data collection methodology against the USAID-approved methodology as reflected in the DQA checklists, and crosschecked WSU and SO PMP indicators against those in the USAID/Malawi OP. The team spot-checked the files for base documents and documentation of the evidence demonstrating achievement of the indicator (e.g., signed per diem receipts to verify attendance at training courses), and spot-checked operations manuals to confirm the existence of written procedures.

The indicators accurately measure the performance of WSU in implementing a multisector program in the Chia Lagoon region of Lake Malawi. The program has two full time M&E officers. It also has a global information systems (GIS) specialist to ensure precise measurements. Students at Bundu and Natural Resource Colleges provide enumerators for program surveys. The M&E officers supervise them closely. A minimum of two persons check all data. The leaders of the program are well aware of the difficulties in collecting data for this type of program and have developed excellent procedures/practices to reduce the problems.

Procedures have been consistent since the beginning of the program. The program is upgrading to improve data processing and allow for more sophisticated analysis of the data. All aspects of the data collection process, from the procedures to the actual data, are reviewed annually. The data undergo review quarterly.

For the most part WSU uses surveys to collect most data, which virtually eliminates double counting. For household listings, individual households are identified by village. The GIS gives exceptionally accurate location data. In terms of public-private partnerships, the numbers are small enough, and the partnerships specific, that double counting is not a major issue.

TABLE 30: DQA STANDARDS SUMMARY—WSU

STANDARD	YES	NO	COMMENT
Validity	X		See text above
Integrity	X		See text above
Precision	X		See text above
Reliability	X		See text above
Timeliness	X		See text above

3.4.2 PROGRAM AREA: ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

Overview: Limited access to affordable financing remains a major constraint to the development of micro, small, and medium-size enterprises (MSMEs) in Malawi. Weak retail capacity of financial institutions, a limited number of financial products, and the perceived high risk of rural and agricultural lending all contribute to the low levels of market penetration in rural and agricultural finance markets. The economic status of MSMEs will be improved by increasing their access to safe and secure financial services, helping to build sustainable financial institutions, establishing strategic alliances in the capital markets, and assisting in the creation of a proper legal and regulatory environment in the microfinance sector. By the end of FY2008, more than 195,000 MSMEs will have access to quality financial services through USG-funded programs.

3.4.2.1 Element: Inclusive Financial Markets

Overview: USAID realizes the importance of integrating financial services for the economically active poor into the overall financial system by providing demand-driven assistance to retail financial institutions and

providers, building the financial infrastructure, and strengthening the enabling policy environment. With few donors engaged in this sector, USAID, as the principal donor, will address constraints impeding the development of an inclusive financial sector to provide equitable access to essential financial services connecting poor households to economic opportunities. The GOM is drafting a new microfinance law and counts on USAID assistance. USAID is deepening the financial sector by expanding access to sustainable financial services for MSMEs. The focus is on low-income households. USG-funded programs increase access to financial services by (1) providing retail capacity-building support to microfinance institutions (MFIs); (2) facilitating access to greater flows of commercial capital for financial intermediaries through targeted assistance, linkages, and brokering; and (3) contributing to a more enabling regulatory, supervisory, and legal framework. Four private MFIs will receive training and technical assistance to achieve operational sustainability and develop new products that extend outreach to rural areas. USG assistance will reach more than 195,000 clients by the end of FY2008.

There is one IP for economic growth/inclusive financial markets: Chemonics International. Indicators for this element are shown in Table 30.

TABLE 31: ECONOMIC GROWTH/INCLUSIVE FINANCIAL MARKETS	
PROGRAM ELEMENT INDICATORS: INCLUSIVE FINANCIAL MARKETS	PRIME PARTNER NAME
1. Number of clients at USG-assisted microfinance institutions (SD)	Chemonics International
2. Total savings deposits held by USG-assisted microfinance institutions	Chemonics International
3. Number of microfinance institutions supported by USG financial or technical assistance	Chemonics International
4. Percent of USG-assisted microfinance institutions that have reached operational sustainability	Chemonics International

Below is the summary of DQA findings for Chemonics International with respect to the collection, compilation, analysis, and reporting of data for the four indicators shown in Table 30.

Partner: Chemonics International

Partner Overview: The Deepening Microfinance Sector Project (DMS) strengthens the financial sector by expanding access to sustainable financial services for MSMEs with a particular focus on low-income households. Four private MFIs receive training and technical assistance to achieve operational sustainability and develop new products that extend outreach to rural areas. USG assistance will have reached more than 195,000 clients by 2008.

Data from Chemonics International contribute to four OP indicators:

- Number of clients at USG-assisted MFIs (SD)
- Total savings deposits held by USG-assisted MFIs
- Number of MFIs supported by USG financial or technical assistance
- Percent of USG-assisted MFIs that have reached operational sustainability

DQA—Chemonics International

The GH Tech team and Archanjel Chinkunda, USAID/Malawi M&E officer, visited the Chemonics International–implemented microfinance project. Victor Luboyeski, Chief of Party, briefed us on the project and its performance management practices. The team reviewed the Chemonics PMP with particular emphasis on the indicators and the evidence used to determine whether they have been achieved. The team assessed the linkage between the Chemonics and USAID/Malawi PMPs, and crosschecked the data collection methodology against the USAID-approved methodology as reflected in the DQA checklists. The team also crosschecked partner and SO PMP indicators against indicators in the USAID/Malawi OP, and spot-checked the files for base documents and documentation of the evidence demonstrating achievement of the indicator (e.g., signed per diem receipts to verify attendance at training courses). The team also spot-checked operations manuals to confirm the existence of written procedures.

Both the Chemonics M&E specialist and the Chief of Party actively review quarterly data received from partners. Data that do not fit the trend lines or seem out of line with previous data for the same indicator are reviewed with the partner and changed if necessary. Partners submit to Chemonics a quarterly electronic report that virtually eliminates transcription error at that level. The problem is potentially more serious at the lending level, but crosschecking data from quarter to quarter reduces the risk.

In its quarterly review process, Chemonics quickly identifies institutions that do not report on time or have missing data. Immediate follow-up to seek out missing data takes place. There is a financial incentive to report data on time and accurately, in that any financial support to the institution is delayed until the data are supplied.

The quality of the data meets the five DQA standards. It is fully adequate for both management and reporting purposes

TABLE 32: DQA STANDARDS SUMMARY—CHEMONICS INTERNATIONAL

STANDARD	YES	NO	COMMENT
Validity	X		See text above
Integrity	X		See text above
Precision	X		See text above
Reliability	X		See text above
Timeliness	X		See text above

3.4.3 PROGRAM AREA: ENVIRONMENT

Overview: Malawi is one of southern Africa's most biodiverse countries, with many species found only within its borders. Forests, wildlife, and fisheries play a major role in rural household economic activities and in their food security, especially during poor harvests. Malawi's high birthrate, overwhelmingly subsistence-agricultural economy, and very limited arable land cause widespread environmental degradation, including severe deforestation, soil depletion, and water contamination. CBOs are the key to arresting these trends and to the adoption of sustainable natural resource management practices. By the end of FY2008, nearly 900 CBOs will have been launched to train almost 85,000 people to manage their own natural resources sustainably; and nearly 190,000 hectares will have been brought under sustainable management plans.

3.4.3.1 Element: Natural Resources and Biodiversity

Overview: Despite efforts by the GOM to address biodiversity conservation, forestry, and environmental issues, the environment is being degraded at an alarming rate, causing loss of soil fertility, increase in erosion, deforestation, water depletion, loss of wildlife, overfishing, increased pollution, and loss of animal, fish, and plant species. Considering that the livelihoods of 5 percent of the rural population depend on natural assets, USAID funding will help to place 190,000 hectares under improved management. More than 180,000

managed hectares practicing biodiversity conservation are creating opportunities for active and effective participation of more than 85,000 local communities while helping them to increase their net incomes. Long-term conservation based on market-driven decisions is beginning to transform the relationship people have with their natural capital assets, moving them from being viewed as "gifts of nature" toward being the foundation of a vibrant rural economy providing strong incentives for sustainable management and reinvestment. Enterprise-driven initiatives within priority ecosystems increase the effectiveness of both natural resources management and biological conservation. In Malawi, these ecosystems are the major sources of water for small-scale irrigation. FY2007 funds will also support the development of democratic local governance and decision-making structures pertaining to allocation and use of natural resources.

The two IPs for natural resources and biodiversity are Africa Parks (Majete) Ltd. and Development Alternatives, Inc. (DAI). Indicators for this element are shown in Table 32.

TABLE 33: NATURAL RESOURCES AND BIODIVERSITY INDICATORS

PROGRAM ELEMENT INDICATORS: NATURAL RESOURCES AND BIODIVERSITY	PRIME PARTNER NAME
1. Number of hectares under improved natural resource management as a result of USG assistance	Africa Parks (Majete) Ltd.; DAI
2. Number of hectares in areas of biological significance under improved management as a result of USG assistance (marine, terrestrial)	Africa Parks (Majete) Ltd.; DAI
3. Number of hectares of natural resources showing improved biophysical conditions as a result of USG assistance	DAI
4. Number of hectares in areas of biological significance showing improved biophysical conditions as a result of USG assistance (marine, terrestrial)	Africa Parks (Majete) Ltd.; DAI
5. Number of policies, laws, agreements, or regulations promoting sustainable natural resource management and conservation that are implemented as a result of USG assistance	DAI
6. Number of people with increased economic benefits derived from sustainable natural resource management and conservation as a result of USG assistance (SD)	DAI
7. Number of people receiving USG-supported training in natural resources management or biodiversity conservation (SD)	DAI

Partner: Africa Parks (Majete) Ltd.

Partner Overview: The project will increase the biodiversity and economic value of the Majete Wildlife Reserve (MWR) by increasing the total number of elephants relocated from 70 to 120 in 2008. This should significantly increase the number of tourists and visitors to MWR and would correspond with an increase in infrastructure development and increased community benefits from resource-sharing mechanisms and other cost/benefit-sharing mechanisms. Assistance to law enforcement activities and community work will ensure that there are improvements in biodiversity conservation and sustainable management of natural resources, and that through stakeholder involvement collaborative management of the reserve is successful. Activities include translocation of 70 elephants to increase the tourist attraction and an aerial game count to get a close estimation of all wildlife at MWR, Community awareness and outreach through facilitation of joint liaison

committee, CBO meetings, and the Annual Stakeholders' Workshop will incorporate input in the project from a diversity of stakeholders and intensify the monitoring of comanagement agreements.

Data from Africa Parks (Majete) Ltd contribute to three OP indicators:

- Number of hectares under improved natural resource management as a result of USG assistance
- Number of hectares in areas of biological significance under improved management as a result of USG assistance (marine, terrestrial)
- Number of hectares in areas of biological significance showing improved biophysical conditions as a result of USG assistance (marine, terrestrial)

DQA—Africa Parks (Majete) Ltd.

The GH Tech team, Archanjel Chinkunda, USAID/Malawi M&E officer, and Patricia Ziwa, CTO, visited the Africa Parks program and obtained an overview of the program and its performance management practices. The team reviewed the partner PMP with particular emphasis on the indicators and the evidence used to determine whether they have been achieved. It assessed the linkage between the Africa Parks and USAID/Malawi PMPs, crosschecked the data collection methodology against the USAID-approved methodology as reflected in the DQA checklists, and crosschecked partner and SO PMP indicators against those in the USAID/Malawi OP. The team also spot-checked files for base documents and documentation of the evidence demonstrating achievement of the indicator. For example, the team reviewed the procedures used to measure the number of hectares brought under improved management and the techniques being used to measure improvement in biophysical conditions. The team also spot-checked operations manuals to confirm the existence of written procedures.

The three indicators accurately measure the impact this activity is having on improving conditions in the Majete reserve. The reserve management staff trains park rangers in the use of global positioning system (GPS) units so that measurement is exceptionally precise and closely supervises the rangers. Reserve management staff reviews all data and promptly corrects any errors they detect. Management staff is aware of the difficult of accurately counting animal life. They have developed innovative survey techniques involving both aerial photography and ground-truthing. All data are crosschecked.

The Majete Reserve has used the same procedures since the start of the project. Its staff reviews the data as they are collected. Data are collected continuously and are sufficient for management needs.

TABLE 34: DQA STANDARDS SUMMARY—AFRICA PARKS (MAJETE) LTD.

STANDARD	YES	NO	COMMENT
Validity	X		See text above
Integrity	X		See text above
Precision	X		See text above
Reliability	X		See text above
Timeliness	X		See text above

Data quality meets USAID standards for managing the project and measuring progress in meeting the three indicators. The team recommends that Mission staff periodically meet with project staff to discuss data issues and to crosscheck records.

Partner: Development Alternatives, Inc.

Partner Overview: Through the Community Partnerships for Sustainable Resource Management in Malawi (COMPASS II) project, USG supports enhancement of household revenue from participation in community-

based natural resource management initiatives that generate income as well as provide incentives for sustainable resource use and biodiversity conservation. This continuing activity builds on previous investments by USAID to increase the capacity of local organizations to implement strategies that ensure long-term economic and environmental sustainability. COMPASS II seeks to increase decentralization of natural resource management, enhance rural community capacity to sustainably manage natural resources and biodiversity, and increase sales of natural resource-based products by rural households. Progress requires devolving authority to manage natural resources to the community level while ensuring that the skills to exercise that authority responsibly and learn to profit from sustainable utilization of natural resources are available. Maintaining natural resources under sustainable management practices contributes to global efforts to curb the negative effects of climate change.

Data from DAI contribute to seven OP indicators:

- Number of hectares under improved natural resource management as a result of USG assistance
- Number of hectares in areas of biological significance under improved management as a result of USG assistance (marine, terrestrial)
- Number of hectares of natural resources showing improved biophysical conditions as a result of USG assistance
- Number of hectares in areas of biological significance showing improved biophysical conditions as a result of USG assistance (marine, terrestrial)
- Number of policies, laws, agreements, or regulations promoting sustainable natural resource management and conservation that are implemented as a result of USG assistance
- Number of people with increased economic benefits derived from sustainable natural resource management and conservation as a result of USG assistance (SD)
- Number of people receiving USG-supported training in natural resources management or biodiversity conservation (SD)

DQA—Development Alternatives, Inc.

The GH Tech team, Archanjel Chinkunda, USAID/Malawi M&E officer, and Patricia Ziwa, CTO, visited the COMPASS II project. Acting Chief of Party John Dickson briefed us on the program and its performance management practices. The team reviewed the partner PMP with particular emphasis on the indicators and the evidence used to determine whether they have been achieved. The team assessed the linkage between partner and USAID/Malawi PMPs and crosschecked the data collection methodology against the USAID-approved methodology as reflected in the DQA checklists. The team also crosschecked partner and SO PMP indicators against those in the USAID/Malawi OP, and spot-checked files for base documents and documentation of the evidence demonstrating achievement of the indicator (e.g., signed per diem receipts to verify attendance at training courses). The team also spot-checked operations manuals to confirm the existence of written procedures.

The seven indicators for the COMPASS II project accurately measure the progress being made on comprehensive natural resources management. The project M&E officer closely supervises data collection in all of its elements and trains enumerators for the surveys done by the project. All data are carefully reviewed and any errors detected are corrected. Surveys are typically the technique of choice for most data collection in this project. The techniques used conform to accepted international practice.

The Chief of Party thoroughly reviews reports for transcription or other errors. Basic procedures have been in place since the beginning of the project. Data are periodically reviewed, especially in preparation of quarterly reports for USAID. The GH Tech team recommends with the turn over in personnel that the new

Chief of Party thoroughly familiarize himself with the procedures, and that the CTO closely check on their implementation over the next six months.

TABLE 35: DQA STANDARDS SUMMARY—DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVES, INC.			
STANDARD	YES	NO	COMMENT
Validity	X		See text above
Integrity	X		See text above
Precision	X		See text above
Reliability	X		See text above
Timeliness	X		See text above

The current data meet USAID standards for management and reporting. COMPASS II developed a detailed M&E manual, including procedures for data collection and management, in 2005. Biodiversity indicators were added to the COMPASSS II PMP in August 2005.

The GH Tech team is concerned for the future. COMPASS II is considering engaging the former M&E specialist part-time to supervise data collection, help compile reports, and ensure compliance with data quality requirements. USAID/Malawi should closely monitor the situation to ensure that data quality is maintained. In particular, for the next two quarterly reports the CTO and a representative of the Program Office should visit COMPASS II two to four weeks before the quarterly report is due to review with the COP data being used for the report.

3.5 FUNCTIONAL GOAL: PROVIDING HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE

3.5.1 PROGRAM AREA: DISASTER READINESS

Overview: Malawi is susceptible to natural disasters such as droughts and flooding and is dependent on food assistance to fulfill its national food requirements. Most households live below the poverty line, and 22 percent of the population is chronically food-insecure. To help the GOM to make informed decisions about an appropriate response, funding is provided to USG's Famine Early Warning System (FEWSNET). FEWSNET captures data that help stakeholders to determine whether and how a response should occur. It also provides guidance as to those most in need. Over the next five years, FEWSNET will continue to provide the USG with an early warning system and to play a lead role in analyzing the data captured by the Malawi Vulnerability Assessment Committee, which should strengthen GOM capacity to intervene in a food security crisis.

Chemonics International is the IP for capacity building, preparedness, and planning. Indicators for this element are shown in Table 35.

3.5.1.1 Element: Capacity Building, Preparedness, and Planning

TABLE 36: CAPACITY BUILDING, PREPAREDNESS, AND PLANNING INDICATORS	
PROGRAM ELEMENT INDICATORS: CAPACITY BUILDING, PREPAREDNESS, AND PLANNING	PRIME PARTNER NAME
1. Number of countries with early warning systems linked to a response system in place as a result of USG assistance (bureau reported)	Chemonics International
2. Number of people trained in disaster preparedness (sd)	Chemonics International

Partner: Chemonics International

Partner Overview: FEWSNET will deliver early warnings of hazards, food insecurity, vulnerability to food insecurity, and famine, and will help develop national emergency early warning and food security monitoring and assessment capabilities. This will assist in sustaining local monitoring and assessment of needs and contribute to the design of both food and nonfood emergency responses. FEWSNET will continue to develop and apply an integrated food security approach that allows a holistic assessment and analytical understanding of food security. It will define and carry out country-specific capacity- and institution-strengthening activities with national partners. Capacity building and network strengthening underpin all aspects of FEWSNET's work. The strategy focuses on a systematic approach to identify needs and opportunities in collaboration with field staff and partners. FEWSNET will continue to focus on consensus-building processes at the technical level to speed action to mitigate food insecurity.

Data from Chemonics International contribute to two OP indicators:

- Number of countries with early warning systems linked to a response system in place as a result of USG assistance (bureau reported)
- Number of people trained in disaster preparedness (sd)

DQA—CHEMONICS INTERNATIONAL

The GH Tech team, Archanjel Chinkunda, USAID/Malawi M&E officer, and Patricia Ziwa, CTO, visited the FEWSNET program. Sam Chimwaza, Country FEWSNET Representative Malawi, and Evance Chapasuka, Deputy Country FEWSNET Representative Malawi briefed the team on the program and its performance management practices. The team reviewed the FEWSNET PMP with particular emphasis on the indicators and the evidence used to determine whether they have been achieved. The team assessed the linkage between the FEWSNET and USAID/Malawi PMPs, crosschecked the data collection methodology against the USAID approved methodology as reflected in the DQA checklists, and crosschecked partner and SO PMP indicators against those in the USAID/Malawi Operational Plan. The team also spot-checked files for base documents and documentation of the evidence demonstrating achievement of the indicator (e.g., signed per diem receipts to verify attendance at training courses), and spot-checked operations manuals.

The two senior FEWSNET staff are highly qualified, have advanced technical degrees, and manage the project effectively. On-site field checks are made of any data anomalies; any errors detected are promptly corrected. On-site checks take up approximately 20 percent of the FEWSNET team time. Staff does an excellent job of analyzing the data; verifying all data, including the remote sensing and meteorological elements; and correcting any anomalies. The data collection process meets the need to inform all relevant Malawian authorities of potential food security problems.

TABLE 37: DQA STANDARDS SUMMARY—CHEMONICS INTERNATIONAL

STANDARD	YES	NO	COMMENT
Validity	X		See text above
Integrity	X		See text above
Precision	X		See text above
Reliability	X		See text above
Timeliness	X		See text above

The quality of the data is as excellent as the component parts allow. It clearly meets the need to provide early warning of potential food security problems in Malawi. Remote sensing is subject to limitations of verification; meteorological projections are subject to significant error.

3.6 MILLENNIUM CHALLENGE CORPORATION INDICATORS

The GH Tech team visited two groups, SUNY and Casals, which are assisting the GOM in meeting MCC threshold criteria. DQA assessments were prepared for both. Based on the examination the GH Tech team believes the data provided by each project meet USAID standards for management and reporting. DQA checklists for these partners can be found in Annex D.

4. CONCLUSIONS, POTENTIAL BEST PRACTICES, AND LESSONS LEARNED

CONCLUSIONS

Partner data meet the standards of integrity, precision, reliability, timeliness, and accuracy. They are clearly adequate for management and operation reporting purposes; however, the indicators are almost exclusively output indicators, which give little indication of actual program impact.

Based on the data from its partners, the USAID/Malawi program seems to be making excellent progress in meeting its targets. Overall, partner indicators and data accurately measure progress in achieving outputs. However, the fit between partner programs and OP indicators is occasionally inexact. One size does not fit all. The requirements of the country OP in many cases forced partners and USAID/Malawi into choices that do not accurately fit the programs.

Based on field visits and spot checks of files, the partners seem to be adequately documenting their data. All partners have adequate written procedures, frequently based on procedures taken from their U.S. home offices that the partners have used extensively in other programs and countries. All partners have followed consistent procedures since the start of their activities. Many partners have taken positive steps to upgrade their processes while retaining basic procedures, definitions, and targets. Spot checks of files consistently produced primary documents, such as reporting sheets, attendance records, and financial payments.

The Mission has responded to the audit report criticism that the FHI data were unreliable with a good faith effort that has corrected the deficiencies.

In the past 12 to 18 months, the lack of adequate travel funds prevented sufficient site visits. Now that the funding issues have been partly resolved, Mission staff need to make more regular field visits that should include physical verification of data. These field visits should include subpartners and ideally should be coordinated with observation of key activities. For example, CTOs should schedule their trips so they can observe training of enumerators and actual data collection.

There is a significant long-term risk to USAID/Malawi, and to the agency as a whole, if there is no persuasive documented evidence of positive impact. Number of persons trained, technical assistance provided, or new technologies tested is not impact. It is well worth USAID/Malawi's efforts to develop this evidence even if Washington does not immediately call for it. It is essential that USAID/Malawi constantly keep in mind that outputs should lead to a significant overall impact. For example, the reason for improved teacher training is so student learning improves; improved learning should show up in higher test scores.

POTENTIAL BEST PRACTICES

"Best practice" is a concept frequently discussed but often misunderstood. It does not mean that an individual or organization does something better than others; often there are multiple reasons for superior performance. Best practice is superior performance that results from a technique, procedure, or practice fitting a particular set of circumstance that others can learn and use to achieve comparable results in similar circumstances. Typically, one can only determine a best practice by careful analysis of the circumstances, the technique, and the results. Thus, because time constraints did not allow for detailed examination of successful practices the team observed, it is not possible for the GH Tech team to state confidently that it has discovered best practices in USAID/Malawi. The team can state there are a number of seemingly successful practices used by USAID/Malawi that the Mission should closely examine to see if they qualify as best practices that can be further extended. Among these are the following:

1. Mission creation of a template for partners to report numerical data against a specific indicator is a useful step. The GH Tech team found the template to be an especially useful document that transmits essential information in a short and readily accessible format. USAID/Malawi could further enhance efficiency by writing software to allow direct input of data from partners. It would be

worthwhile for the Mission to explore the value of slightly expanding the template to list highest-priority actions for the coming quarter and the status of actions from the most recent quarter.

2. Establishing databases that automatically raise an alert if a number is over or under certain limits would further reduce transcription and other errors.

3. Linking training attendance with per diem payments is a useful crosscheck. Use of Train-net also seems to be useful.

4. USAID/Malawi is supporting three education activities that are attempting to measure various elements of the primary education process. MTTA, PSSP, and EMIS (AED) all appear to have a sound methodology and each uses innovative methods to train enumerators. It would be worth a significant effort to identify potential best practices used by the activities. In particular, the GH Tech team suggests examining the school reporting systems used in the districts in which MTTA and PSSP work to see if there are cost-effective practices that Malawi can extend nationwide. The team also suspects there is potential for doing very useful analytical work using the more detailed district level data from MTTA and PSSP to crosscheck with the single annual survey of the nation by EMIS (AED).

5. The use of GPS in conjunction with surveys by WSU, Africa Parks, and CDC could well be a best practice that other programs could emulate. Clearly not all programs require the degree of accuracy possible with the use of GIS technology; however, for those that do, it might be useful for the Mission to explore how the technology can be affordably obtained.

6. All projects have M&E staff, usually more than one. That includes most subpartners. An initial discussion between CTOs and the Program Office about which partner M&E practices seem to be especially effective, followed by a discussion with all the partners, should yield useful information that can be used to improve performance.

7. Quarterly review of the data by the CTO and the partners is a positive step. These reviews should focus on the indicator data because if the indicators are valid the data used to measure progress on them should accurately measure if the activity is succeeding or failing. Making the numbers is usually essential for the project to succeed.

8. Double counting can be an issue for some projects even if most partners do not believe it is a major concern. In Malawi, at this time, assigning a correction figure of from minus 10 percent to 20 percent is a useful field expedient.

EDUCATION—POTENTIAL BEST PRACTICES

Over the last several years, the Government of Malawi has made a major commitment to improve its educational system, particularly primary education. This commitment is generating generous donor support. In support of the national program, USAID/Malawi is supporting three education activities that are attempting to measure various elements of the primary education process. Each has an extensive and readily retrievable database. MTTA and PSSP have done extensive testing of student achievement, and the EMIS (AED) project has established a national database. Each activity—MTTA, PSSP, and EMIS (AED)—appears to have a sound methodology and use innovative training methods to improve both academic performance and data collection.

These three activities represent a major contribution to the entire Malawi educational system because the three databases accurately measure the impact of various interventions, such as 1) establishment of basic administrative systems, 2) upgrading teacher training, 3) support for increased community and parental involvement, and 4) achievement testing. (The team notes that a distance learning activity is just starting.)

Those databases seem to indicate that at this time Malawi is getting a relatively low return, in terms of student achievement, on its educational investment. On the positive side, the same databases hold the potential, through increased analysis, for identifying cost-effective methods of significantly increasing student

performance. The GH Tech team is of the view that the goal should be a steady 2% to 3% annual increase in student achievement. The MTTA project is currently achieving this level. The databases represent a sound basic platform upon which to build.

To make each of these databases fully useful, it is worth a significant effort to identify potential best practices used by the activities. These might include the following:

1. **Review the testing regime.** Currently Malawian primary school children appear to do poorly on standardized tests. For example, on the MTTA third-grade test pegged at the Malawian level, less than 10 percent pass. On the PSSP sixth-grade test, which approximates international standards, no one appears to pass at the highest level. It is a very positive step that MTTA and PSSP are testing achievement. It is equally positive that USAID is supporting testing at different levels of achievement and different grade levels. It may be that adjusting the testing regime to fit more closely the skill level of actual Malawian students will hasten the day when significant numbers of Malawian students equal their international counterparts. It would also be useful to determine if other donors are also testing and, if so, what are their results. Perhaps it would be helpful to test at different levels of achievement.

2. **Identify schools, by location and age, where students do especially well in achievement tests**. Within those schools, is it possible to identify teaching practices that seem to generate higher test scores?

3. **Determine if there is a point at which Malawian students significantly close the achievement gap between themselves and the students of other nations.** The excellent quality of the Malawian officials with whom the GH Tech team worked indicated that this might be the case.

4. **Strengthen basic school administration**. Begin by identifying the most effectively administered schools. Establish if there are correlations between administrative improvement and test scores. Determine how much time schools need before improvements in school administration result in improvement in student achievement. In particular, the GH Tech team suggests examining school reporting systems in the districts in which MTTA and PSSP work to see if there are cost-effective practices that Malawi can extend nationwide. The team also suspects there is potential for doing useful analytical work using the more detailed district level data from MTTA and PSSP to crosscheck with the single annual survey of the nation by EMIS (AED).

5. **Share data.** The EMIS (AED) program publishes a widely circulated annual report that includes the most current education data available in Malawi. Impressively, the data are for the actual year of the report. Malawi is the only nation in southeast Africa that achieves this standard. The MTTA and PTTP activities provide significantly greater information in their areas of operation. One suspects that other donors also have databases. It is hoped that pooling all these data, using similar, if not identical, collection protocols, will extend coverage and, most importantly, increase knowledge of the sector as a whole.

6. **Share methodology**. All three activities appear to have excellent management and strong M&E officers as reflected in training and supervision of enumerators and both hard copy and electronic databases. Making this expertise available to other donors by sharing training materials or perhaps even providing trainers could significantly expand the impact of the USAID-financed programs. In this regard, it may be cost-effective to use scanners to provide a relatively low cost means of transferring data and significantly upgrading project analytical capabilities.

7. **Strengthen parental involvement with the schools and their children's education**. Identify Malawian parental practices that result in improved academic performance. North America demonstrates that children whose parents are actively involved with their children's education (especially those who frequently read to them) perform significantly better in school. This is a

difficult protocol for many Malawian parents, who have limited academic skills, to follow. Nevertheless, identifying schools with high parental involvement (and within those schools parents with particularly successful children) is likely to be useful. If reading to children reflects involvement in the U.S., the team suspects it is attendance in Malawi.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

USAID is in the midst of one of its periodic revision periods. USAID/Malawi should use this opportunity to modify its M&E system to make it more user-friendly and less onerous. The need is to provide the same level of information with no greater expenditure of time and resources while making the information more useful for improving performance. In the view of the GH Tech team, this means doing several things:

1. Take a cohesive strategic view of how your program fits together with both its component parts and the development of Malawi. From top to bottom, Mission personnel should have a clear view of what impact the program is intended to have within the next three to five years and what indicators will measure achievement of that impact. Probably the most efficient way to do this is to draft a short strategic narrative, followed by some type of strategic framework, matched up with a PMP.

2. Draw up an overall Mission PMP that includes impact indicators to measure the success of your strategy. Impact indicators are essential to maintaining strategic focus. The GH Tech team notes that most USAID/Malawi partners already collect some impact data, though most of the indicators USAID/Malawi currently uses are output indicators. That is a necessary step but inadequate if the mission is to make a significant contribution to the development of Malawi. A rolling DQA should be part of the plan.

3. Review the fit between partner activities and the OP, which occasionally appears inexact. Targets should reflect development reality in Malawi. Early in the programming year, the Mission should review with the partners their targets and indicators. Based on this review, the Mission should then review the OP indicators to determine if common indicators more accurately reflecting actual program activities are available, or if modifications can create a better fit. Set targets that your partners can meet and that show gradual and appropriate improvement. The Mission probably needs to tailor some standardized indicators to specific programs. The team advises using the standardized definitions but adding a Malawian context. The mission should also review who is responsible for reporting on what indicators.

4. Increase field visits by Mission personnel. There is no substitute for face-to-face field contact. During field visits, take the opportunity to check partner data. Set a target of each CTO making one site visit per quarter. In particular, seek out opportunities to verify subpartner data.

5. As part of the portfolio review process, review partner performance data quarterly at the SO level and no less than semi-annually by Mission management. The Mission may wish to consider staggering the review process, reviewing half the partners each quarter. Primary questions need to be, "Did the partner meet its indicator numbers?" and "Why, or why not?"

6. Seek out best practices for dissemination. Similarly, look for success stories—activities that show improvement in both the macro numbers and the lives of specific Malawian families—that the Administrator can use in briefing Congress.

7. Make the OP more user-friendly. Although it is a useful document in that it lists activities and outputs, it is awkward to use. The GH Team recognizes that a computer in Washington largely determines the shape of the document; the computer needs some clear human guidance from USAID/Malawi.

8. Create a process for accurately tracking the progress of centrally funded activities. The GH Tech team realizes this can be difficult. Start by listing projects the Mission is directly funding. If personnel resources permit, appoint someone to serve as a de facto CTO for centrally funded projects. Frequently Program Offices service this function.

9. Rationalize the quarterly reporting formats across the portfolio and make provisions so that the mission IT system can directly receive, record, and analyze data from partners. One size does not fit

all, but it should be possible to develop a Mission-wide format that each SO can modify to meet specific program needs. The reporting template currently used by the Mission is an excellent starting point.

10. Disaggregate by gender when possible. Though it is not easy to do, showing positive gender results is normally a help in budget negotiations.

11. Develop a rolling DQA process. Begin by requiring a DQA with any evaluation. Allow adequate time to check subpartner data collection.

12. Hold a conference with your partners aimed at improving implementation by better use of performance data. Almost all the partners the GH Tech team visited expressed strong interest in a follow-up that would help them upgrade their data management skills. Holding a one- to two-day conference that looks at data collection as a means of improving performance will pay significant dividends. The challenge, as the team sees it, is continuing to collect high-quality output data while expanding the indicators to focus greater attention on impact, but doing so with the same expenditure of time and resources, and then integrating that information into daily activities.

ANNEX A: SCOPE OF WORK FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR COMPREHENSIVE DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FOR USAID/MALAWI

October 11, 2007

BACKGROUND

USAID/Malawi intends to conduct a data quality assessment (DQA) for all indicators of its development program as detailed in the FY2007 Operational Plan for Malawi in October 2007. Aurora Associates International, Inc. conducted the last DQA for USAID/Malawi's development program in February 2004. However, ADS 203 requires that data quality should be reassessed as is necessary, but at intervals of no greater than three years (ADS, E203.5.5e). Any reassessment should include a review of all relevant performance indicators (at both objective and intermediate results levels)[1] and should cover each data source. As such, the next data quality assessment is due before the end of 2007.

Secondly, the strategic plan for USAID/Malawi covering the period 2001 to 2007 is expected to end at the end of 2007. In line with the new Foreign Assistance Framework and the Agency policy, USAID/Malawi adopted the Operational Plan (OP) process as a tool for guiding all its operations for 2007. The first OP for FY07 is being implemented.

The FY07 OP has a set of new indicators for monitoring performance of programs, projects, and activities supported by USAID/Malawi. Given the new indicators, it is imperative that USAID/Malawi conducts a broader DQA covering all indicators including the new FY07 OP indicators to identify data quality issues and resolve any data quality challenges as appropriately as possible.

PURPOSE OF THE DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT

The Scope of Work (SOW) responds to the Technical Assistance (TA) requirements by USAID/Malawi to conduct a DQA for all its indicators outlined in the FY07 OP and covering all the four Strategic Objective (SO) Teams. USAID/Malawi has four SO Teams, comprising Sustainable Economic Growth (SEG); Health, Population, and Nutrition (HPN); Education (EDUC); and Democracy and Good Governance/Millennium Challenge Corporation Initiative (DG/MCC) Team.

USAID/Malawi wants to ensure that all performance data reported to USAID/W meets all the data quality standards as per ADS 203 and that it is valid, complete, accurate, and consistent with management needs. As such, the TA will conduct a comprehensive DQA of USAID/Malawi partners and grantees as a follow up to the DQA performed in February 2004.

The purpose of the exercise is to assess the data management systems of USAID/Malawi development program partners and grantees through analyzing data for USAID/Malawi development program indicators using USG data quality standards of validity, reliability, integrity, precision, and timeliness as per USAID's Automated Directives System (ADS 203) series. The assessment will also support and facilitate the improvement of USAID/Malawi's development program partners' performance monitoring systems.

The DQA will assess the quality of data and information submitted by partners and grantees by analyzing the process in which it is collected, stored, and ultimately provided to USAID/Malawi and USAID/W. The DQA is expected to highlight strengths and weaknesses of USAID/Malawi primary and secondary data including an improvement plan for the USAID/Malawi and implementing partners' data management systems. In summary, the DQA focus will be to:

---

[1] The introduction of the Operational Plan (OP) process and the new standardized OP indicators have rendered the language of Strategic Objectives (SOs) and Intermediate Results (IRs) outdated.

a. Assess the quality of data submitted by USAID/Malawi partners in relation to the data quality standards of validity, reliability, timeliness, precision, and integrity.

b. Assess the systems the various USAID/Malawi partners use to collect and analyze the data.

c. Assess the flow of information and data from the initial collection point, how data are recorded, and reported to higher levels in the organization.

d. Assess the management information systems the various partners use to record, maintain, and report data.

e. Identify areas of potential vulnerability that affect general credibility and usefulness of the datasets.

f. Recommend measures to address any identified weaknesses in the data submitted by USAID/Malawi partners and data from secondary sources as well as for the M&E procedures and systems in place at both partner level and USAID.

The assessment will be conducted in collaboration with the Mission's M&E unit and include a capacity building exercise for the unit.

METHODOLOGY

The GH Tech Data Quality Assessment Team will conduct assessments through site visits using a standardized on-site tool (Annex 1). The team will analyze each indicator at each stage of the data management system (from collection through reporting) and evaluate it for validity, reliability, integrity, precision, and timeliness.

The indicators will be selected with the relevant SO Teams and the Program Office from USAID/Malawi. The TA will also assess whether USAID/Malawi development program's internal systems and controls conform to USAID data quality standards. This will involve

a. A half-day workshop on DQA for the Mission M&E unit (to be held at the end of the DQA)

b. A desk review of documents, such as original proposals, Performance Management Plans (PMPs), the FY07 OP for Malawi, and any quarterly or annual reports submitted to USAID/W

c. A desktop review of the partners' indicators against the indicators collected by USAID/Malawi

d. Interviews with SO team members to obtain briefing on the program and understand indicators and data needs and the context in which indicators are used to depict SO performance

e. Interviews with partners and secondary data providers in order to review the programs for data collection, use, and analysis in relation to the ADS 203.3.5

f. Examine partner indicators in relation to the FY07 OP, SO PMPs and prepare the DQA worksheet

g. A systems analysis of USAID/Malawi internal M&E systems

h. Verify exactly where data are stored and how they are filed

4.0 TEAM COMPOSITION

The GH Tech DQA Team shall be composed of three people (two international experts and one virtual team member) with the following qualifications:

a. A minimum of a master's degree in a relevant field

b. Knowledge of USAID M&E, reporting requirements, and DQA tools and standards

c. A minimum of five years relevant professional experience in M&E, strategic information management, and DQAs, preferably with institutions in the African Region

d. Excellent report writing and presentation skills

5.0 DELIVERABLES

The GH Tech DQA Team will provide the following deliverables:

a. A workshop for the Mission M&E unit

b. A report on the DQA for USAID/Malawi partners

c. Debriefing with USAID/Malawi management staff and SO teams on the DQA

d. Recommendations for data management systems within USAID/Malawi

e. A data quality improvement plan for USAID/Malawi partners

f. Submit copies of the final report of the data quality report taking into account any constructive suggestions from the stakeholders.

PROCEDURES: SCHEDULE AND LOGISTICS TIMEFRAME

6.1 SCHEDULE

The DQA is scheduled to be conducted in October 2007. USAID/Malawi anticipates the assessment shall be conducted within a period of three weeks. The tentative schedule is as follows:

ITEM	TASK	DURATION*
1	Travel to Malawi	2 days
2	DQA workshop (prep + workshop)	2 days
3	Pre-desk review of background documentation	2 days
4	Meet with USAID/Malawi SO Teams	2 days
5	Meet partners and secondary data sources	8 days
6	Report writing (leave draft in country)	3 days
7	Debriefing meetings	1 day
8	Depart Malawi	1 day
9	Prepare final DQA report (out of country)	5 days
Total		26 days (each international consultant)

*Virtual team member = 15 days LOE estimate

USAID/Malawi in collaboration with implementing partners and the GH Tech DQA team shall develop a detailed schedule and timeline for the exercise.

6.2 LOGISTICS

The DQA team shall work at USAID/Malawi offices in the NICO Building, City Center, Lilongwe, but will work closely with the Program Office, SO Teams, and Implementing Partners. Depending on the contractual arrangements, the Mission will provide office space, including access to the Mission computer network or web-only access, telephone, fax, photocopier, and any other necessary equipment. Mission motor pool vehicles will be available for hotel-Mission-hotel transfers, field travel on request, and, as available, for after hours and weekends. Support services will be provided by USAID/Malawi.

REPORTING AND DISSEMINATION REQUIREMENTS

The DQA results shall be presented in a draft report at a full debriefing meeting with USAID/Malawi and possibly at a follow-up meeting with key stakeholders. The final report shall be submitted to USAID/Malawi in hard copy and electronic format. After the debriefing meeting, the DQA team shall incorporate all comments received from USAID/Malawi and partners. Within two weeks of receiving the final comments from the USAID/Malawi and partners, the DQA team shall send the final report in electronic and hard copies: two hard copies and a CD-ROM.

MISSION POINT OF CONTACT

Archanjel Chinkunda, PDA M&E Specialist, Tel (265) 1 772455 Ext. 115, Fax: (265) 1 773181, Email: achinkunda@usaid.gov.

DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST

USAID/NAME DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
Objective:	
Area:	
Element:	
Indicator title:	
Is this a standard or custom indicator? If standard, make sure the title matches the title in the Indicator Handbooks.	___ Standard _____Custom
Data source(s):	_____ Survey/KAP _____ Implementing partner reports _____ Other (Be specific)
USAID control over data:	_____ High (USAID is source or funds data collection) ___ Medium (Implementing partner is data source) _____ Low (Data are from a secondary source)
Partner or contractor who provided the data (if applicable)	
Year or period for which the data are being reported	
Data assessment methodology	Describe in detail and attach to the checklist**
Date(s) of assessment:	
Assessment team members:	

USAID/NAME
For Office Use Only Team Leader approval X_____ DP Clearance (Chief AFR/DP/POSE) X _____

Is there a direct relationship between the program activity and what is being measured? If not, explain connection to the result.			
Can the result be plausibly attributed to USG assistance?			
Are the people collecting data qualified and properly supervised?			
Are steps taken to correct known data errors?			
Were known data collection problems appropriately assessed?			
Are steps being taken to limit transcription error?			
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?			
Is a consistent data collection process used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source?			
Are there procedures in place for periodic review of data collection, maintenance, and documentation in writing?			
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?			
Is a regularized schedule of data collection in place to meet program management needs?			
Are data properly stored and readily available?			
Is there a method for detecting duplicate data?			
Is there a method for detecting missing data?			

CATEGORY	YES	NO	COMMENTS
INTEGRITY			
Are there proper safeguards in place to prevent unauthorized changes to the data?			
Is there a need for an independent review of results reported?			
IF NO RELEVANT DATA WERE AVAILABLE	COMMENTS		
If no recent relevant data are available for this indicator, why not?			
What concrete actions are now being undertaken to collect and report these data as soon as possible?			
When will data be reported?			

SUMMARY	COMMENTS
Based on the assessment relative to the five standards, what is the overall conclusion regarding the quality of the data?	
Significance of limitations (if any):	
Actions needed to address limitations (given level of USAID control over data):	

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONDUCTING DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENTS

1. Individual(s) conducting the DQA should describe in detail the methodology that will be used to conduct the DQA. This is required for each indicator. This information should be approved before the DQA is conducted.

2. DQ assessors should make sure that they understand the precise definition of the indicator. Please address any issues of ambiguity before the DQA is conducted.

3. DQ assessor should have a copy of the methodology for data collection in hand before assessing the indicator. This information should be in the PMP file for each indicator. Each indicator should have a written description of how the data being assessed are collected.

4. Each implementing partner should have a copy of the method of data collection in their files and documented evidence that they are collecting the data according to the methodology.

5. Assessor should record the names and titles of all individuals involved in the assessment.

6. Does the implementing partner have documented evidence that it has verified the data that has been reported to USAID? Partners should be able to provide USAID with documents (process/person conducting the verification/field visit dates/persons met/activities visited, etc) that demonstrate that they have verified the data reported to USAID. Note: Verification by the partners should be an ongoing process.

7. The DQ assessor should be able to review the implementing partner files/records against the methodology for data collection laid out in the PMP. Any data quality concerns should be documented.

8. The assessor should verify the partner data at the field level using the PMP methodology. Any data quality concerns should be documented.

9. Storage of data is critical to this process. The assessor should document any and all weaknesses in the files/record keeping associated with the indicator being reviewed.

10. The DQA should include a summary of all weaknesses found; the significance of the weaknesses; and recommendations for addressing the findings. A plan of action for addressing the weaknesses should be made and a follow-up date set for reassessment.

DOCUMENTS FOR REVIEW

1. FY07 Operational Plan for Malawi
2. USAID/Malawi Country Strategic Plan for 2001–2007
3. USAID/Malawi Performance Management Plans (PMPs)
4. Quarterly Reports
5. Annual Reports
6. Data Quality Assessment Reports
7. Evaluation Reports

STAKEHOLDERS TO BE CONSULTED

1. USAID/Malawi SO Teams
2. USAID/Malawi Implementation Partners
3. Secondary Data Providers

ANNEX B: MALAWI FY2007 OPERATIONAL PLAN INDICATORS FUNCTIONAL OBJECTIVE/ELEMENT

FUNCTIONAL GOAL: PEACE AND SECURITY		
PROGRAM AREA	PROGRAM ELEMENT	INDICATOR
3. Stabilization Operations and Security Sector Reform	3.6 Defense, military, and border security restructuring and operations	3. 6.1 Number of U.S. trained personnel at national leadership levels 3. 6.2 Number of host country military personnel trained to maintain territorial integrity

FUNCTIONAL GOAL: GOVERNING JUSTLY AND DEMOCRATICALLY		
PROGRAM AREA	PROGRAM ELEMENT	INDICATOR
9. Political competition and consensus building	9.2 Elections and political processes	9. 2.3 Number of elections officials trained with USG assistance (SD) 9. 2.4 Number of people reached by voter education with USG assistance

FUNCTIONAL GOAL: INVESTING IN PEOPLE		
PROGRAM AREA	PROGRAM ELEMENT	INDICATOR
11. Health	11.2 Tuberculosis	11 .2.1 Case notification rate in new sputum smear positive pulmonary TB cases in USG-supported areas (SD) 11 .2.2 Number of people trained in DOTS with USG funding (SD) 11 .2.3 Average population per USG-supported laboratories performing TB microscopy with over 95% correct results 11 .2.4 Percent of all registered TB patients who are tested for HIV through USG-supported programs (SD) 11 .2.5 Existence of multi-drug resistance for TB at the national level (Y/N) 11 .2.7 Number of TB cases reported to NTP by USG-assisted non-MOH sector (SD) 11 .2.8 Percent of USG-supported laboratories performing TB microscopy with over 95% correct microscopy results
11. Health	11.3 Malaria	11 .3.1 Number of ITNs distributed that were purchased or subsidized with USG support 11 .3.2 Number of houses sprayed with insecticide with USG support 11 .3.21 Number of evaluations conducted by the USG

FUNCTIONAL GOAL: INVESTING IN PEOPLE		
PROGRAM AREA	PROGRAM ELEMENT	INDICATOR
		(process/ results/impact/other) 11 .3.23 Number of information-gathering or research activities conducted by the USG 11 .3.3 Number of people trained in malaria treatment or prevention with USG funds (SD) 11 .3.5 Number of artemisinin-based combination treatments (ACTs) purchased and distributed with USG support 11 .3.6 Number of improvements to laws, policies, regulations, or guidelines related to improved access to and use of health services drafted with USG support 11 .3.8 Number of USG- assisted service delivery points (SDPs) experiencing stock-outs of specific tracer drugs 11 .3.9 Number of people reached through community outreach activities that promote the correct and consistent use of ITNs 11 .3.10 Number of people reached through community outreach activities that promote the treatment of malaria according to national guidelines
11. Health	11.4 Avian influenza	11 .4.1 Number of USG-provided PPE kits delivered to requesting country 11 .4.2 Number of people trained in avian and pandemic influenza-related knowledge and/or skills(SD) 11 .4.3 Number of people who have seen or heard a USG-funded avian or pandemic influenza–related message 11 .4.4 Number of improvements to laws, policies, regulations, or guidelines related to improved access to health services drafted with USG support
11. Health	11.6 Maternal and child health	11 .3.6 Number of improvements to laws, policies, regulations, or guidelines related to improved access to and use of health services drafted with USG support 11 .6.1 Number of postpartum/newborn visits within 3 days of birth in USG-assisted programs 11 .6.10 Number of cases of child pneumonia treated with antibiotics by trained Facility or community health workers in USG-supported programs 11 .6.14 Liters of drinking water disinfected with USG-supported point-of-use treatment products 11 .6.15 Number of cases of child diarrhea treated by USAID-assisted programs 11 .6.2 Number of antenatal care visits by skilled providers from USG-assisted facilities 11 .6.21 Number of health facilities rehabilitated 11 .6.3 Number of people trained in maternal and/or

FUNCTIONAL GOAL: INVESTING IN PEOPLE		
PROGRAM AREA	PROGRAM ELEMENT	INDICATOR
		newborn health through USG-supported programs (SD) 11 .6.5 Number of people trained in child health care and child nutrition through USG-supported health area programs (SD) 11 .6.6 Number of women giving birth who received AMSTL through USG-supported programs 11 .6.8 Number of newborns receiving essential newborn care through USG-supported programs 11 .6.9 Number of children reached by USG-supported nutrition programs 11 .6.10 Number of children under 5 years provided with OHTs 11 .6.11 Number of households accessing water sources constructed using USG assistance 11 .6.12 Number of latrines constructed and households having access to them 11 .6.13 Number of mothers provided with information on nutrition and diarrheal and other associated illnesses
11. Health	11.7 Family planning and reproductive health	11 .7.1 Couple-years of protection (CYP) in USG-supported programs 11 .7.2 Number of people trained in FP/RH with USG funds (SD) 11 .7.3 Number of counseling visits for FP/RH as a result of USG assistance (SD) 11 .7.4 Number of people that have seen or heard a specific USG-supported FP/RH message 11 .7.5 Number of policies or guidelines developed or changed with USG assistance to improve access to and use of FP/RH services 11 .7.6 Number of new approaches successfully introduced through USG- supported programs 11 .7.7 Number of USG- assisted SDPs providing FP counseling or services 11 .7.9 Number of SDPs reporting stock-outs of any contraceptive commodity offered by the SDP at any time during the reporting period
12. Education	12.1 Basic education	12. 1.3 Number of learners enrolled in USG-supported primary schools or equivalent non-school-based settings (SD) 12. 1.6 Number of teachers/educators trained with USG support (SD) 12. 2.10 Number of host country institutions with improved management information systems as a result of USG assistance

FUNCTIONAL GOAL: INVESTING IN PEOPLE		
PROGRAM AREA	PROGRAM ELEMENT	INDICATOR
		12. 2.11 Number of host country institutions that have used USG-assisted MIS information to inform administrative/management decisions 12. 2.14 Number of people trained in strategic information management with USG assistance
13. Social and Economic Services & Protection for Vulnerable Populations	13.3 Social assistance	13. 3.1 Number of people benefiting from USG-supported social assistance programming (number of men, women, food insecure, HIV-affected, female-headed households, other targeted vulnerable people)
18. Agriculture	18.1 Agriculture-enabling environment	18. 1.10 Number of individuals who have received short-term agriculture-enabling environment training as a result of USG assistance (gender-disaggregated)
18. Agriculture	18.2 Agriculture sector productivity	18. 2.10 Number of public/private partnerships formed as a result of USG assistance 18. 2.11 Number of individuals who have received USG-supported short-term agricultural sector productivity training (SD) 18. 2.15 Amount of private financing mobilized with a DCA guarantee 18. 2.4 Number of new technologies or management practices made available for transfer as a result of USG assistance 18. 2.6 Number of vulnerable households benefiting directly from USG assistance 18. 2.7 Number of rural households benefiting directly from USG assistance 18. 2.8 Number of producer organizations, water users associations, trade and business associations, and community based organizations receiving USG assistance 18. 2.9 Number of agriculture-related firms benefiting directly from USG-supported interventions
20. Economic Opportunity	20.1 Inclusive financial markets	20. 1.1 Number of clients at USG-assisted microfinance institutions (SD) 20. 1.2 Total savings deposits held by USG-assisted microfinance institutions 20. 1.4 Number of microfinance institutions supported by USG financial or technical assistance 20. 1.5 Percent of USG-assisted microfinance institutions that have reached operational sustainability
21. Environment	21.1 Natural resources and biodiversity	21. 1.1 Number of hectares under improved natural resource management as a result of USG assistance

FUNCTIONAL GOAL: INVESTING IN PEOPLE		
PROGRAM AREA	PROGRAM ELEMENT	INDICATOR
		21. 1.2 Number of hectares in areas of biological significance under improved management as a result of USG assistance (marine, terrestrial) 21. 1.3 Number of hectares of natural resources showing improved biophysical conditions as a result of USG assistance 21. 1.4 Number of hectares in areas of biological significance showing improved biophysical conditions as a result of USG assistance (marine, terrestrial) 21. 1.5 Number of policies, laws, agreements, or regulations promoting sustainable natural resource management and conservation that are implemented as a result of USG assistance 21. 1.6 Number of people with increased economic benefits derived from sustainable natural resource management and conservation as a result of USG assistance (SD) 21. 1.7 Number of people receiving USG-supported training in natural resources management and/or biodiversity conservation (SD)
23. Disaster Readiness	23.1 Capacity building, preparedness, and planning	23. 1.2 Number of countries with early warning systems linked to a response system in place as a result of USG assistance (bureau reported) 23. 1.3 Number of people trained in disaster preparedness (SD)

ANNEX C: MALAWI DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT CHECKLISTS

USAID/MALAWI DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	PEACE AND SECURITY
Area:	3.0 Stabilization Operations and Security Sector Reform
Element:	3.6 Defense, military, and border security restructuring and operations
Indicator title:	3. 6.1 Number of US trained personnel at national leadership levels 3. 6.2 Number of host country military personnel trained to maintain territorial integrity
Is this a standard or custom indicator? If standard, make sure the title matches the title in the Indicator Handbooks.	__X_ Standard _____Custom
Data source(s):	_____ Survey/KAP __X_ Implementing partner reports _____ Other (Be Specific)
USAID control over data:	_____ High (USAID is source and/or funds data collection) _X Medium (Implementing partner is data source) _____ Low (Data are from a secondary source)
Partner or contractor who provided the data (if applicable)	Department of Defense (DOD)
Year or period for which the data are being reported	October 1, 2006, to September 30, 2007
Data assessment methodology	The GH Tech team and Archanjel Chinkunda, USAID/Malawi M&E officer, visited DOD offices to review how training data is collected. The team was briefed by Katezi Zimba, Military Program Assistant, and John Letvin, Political/Military officer.
Date(s) of assessment:	November 9, 2007
Assessment team members:	Archanjel Chinkunda and Norman L. Olsen
For Office Use Only X _____	

CATEGORY	YES	NO	COMMENTS
VALIDITY			
Is there a direct relationship between the program activity and what is being measured? If not, explain connection to the result.	X		The two indicators accurately reflect the training DOD is conducting for the MDF.
Can the result be plausibly attributed to USG assistance?	X		Without USG assistance, the MDF would not be receiving this level of training.
Are the people collecting data qualified and properly supervised?	X		The Military Program Assistant is fully qualified to manage this program, including collecting all of the relevant data. He is adequately supervised.
Are steps taken to correct known data errors?	X		Because of the relatively small number of trainees and the well-established processing procedures, data error is not a major issue.
Were known data collection problems appropriately assessed?	NA		
Are steps being taken to limit transcription error?	X		Transcription error is not a major issue in this program.
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?	NA		
RELIABILITY			
Is a consistent data collection process used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source?	X		The data collection processes have been stable for a number of years.
Are there procedures in place for periodic review of data collection, maintenance, and documentation in writing?	X		Data is reviewed for each training course and for the preparation of consolidated reports.
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?	NA		
TIMELINESS			
Is a regularized schedule of data collection in place to meet program management needs?	X		Data collection is sufficiently timely and accurate for all management purposes.
Is data properly stored and readily available?	X		Data is stored on site and in DOD facilities in CONUS.
PRECISION			
Is there a method for detecting duplicate data?	X		Trainees are identified by name, rank, and course.
Is there a method for detecting missing data?	X		
INTEGRITY			
Are there proper safeguards in place to prevent unauthorized changes to the data?	X		Access is limited to the Military Program Assistant and the Pol/Mil representative.
Is there a need for an independent review of results reported?		X	

IF NO RELEVANT DATA WERE AVAILABLE	COMMENTS
If no recent relevant data are available for this indicator, why not?	NA
What concrete actions are now being undertaken to collect and report these data as soon as possible?	
When will data be reported?	

SUMMARY	COMMENTS
Based on the assessment relative to the five standards, what is the overall conclusion regarding the quality of the data?	DOD data for tracking of trainees meets USAID standards.
Significance of limitations (if any):	The data accurately measures output but does not measure impact.
Actions needed to address limitations (given level of USAID control over data):	NA

USAID/MALAWI DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	INVESTING IN PEOPLE
Area:	11. Health
Element:	11.2 Tuberculosis
Indicator title:	11. 2.1 Case notification rate in new sputum smear positive pulmonary TB cases in USG-supported areas (SD)
Is this a standard or custom indicator? If standard, make sure the title matches the title in the Indicator Handbooks.	__X_ Standard ____Custom
Data source(s):	____ Survey/KAP __X__ Implementing partner reports ____ Other (Be specific)
USAID control over data:	____ High (USAID is source and/or funds data collection) X _Medium (Implementing partner is data source) ____ Low (Data are from a secondary source)
Partner or contractor who provided the data (if applicable):	KNCV/Management Sciences for Health (MSH): Tuberculosis Control Assistance Program (TBCAP)
Year or period for which the data are being reported:	October 1, 2006, to September 30, 2007
Data assessment methodology:	The DQA team; Nyembezi Mfune, USAID/Malawi Program

USAID/MALAWI DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	INVESTING IN PEOPLE
	Acquisition and Assistance Specialist; and Lily Banda-Maliro USAID/Malawi Deputy Team Leader (Health Office), visited the MSH/TBCAP located at the offices of the National TB Programme on November 6, 2007. June D. Mwafulirwa, TBCAP Project Coordinator, and Maxwell Moyo, TBCAP M&E Specialist, briefed the team. The team obtained an overview of the TBCAP program and its performance management practices, including its reporting system plan. TBCAP started up in Malawi in April 2007 and has not completely implemented the reporting system. For most of its OP indicators, National MOH data are used to report on activities in the two implementation districts. The GH Tech team reviewed the partner's PMP with particular emphasis on indicators and the evidence used to determine whether they have been achieved. The GH Tech team assessed the linkage between the partner's and USAID/Malawi's PMPs. The GH Tech team crosschecked the partner's data collection methodology against the USAID-approved methodology as reflected in the DQA checklists. The GH Tech team crosschecked partner and SO PMP indicators against those in the USAID/Malawi Operational Plan. The GH Tech team selectively spot-checked the partner's files for base documents and documentation of the evidence demonstrating achievement of the indicator (e.g., training logs, data quality logs, and data tracking sheets). The GH Tech team spot-checked operational manuals to confirm the existence of written procedures.
Date(s) of assessment:	November 6, 2007
Assessment team members:	Barry Silverman, Nyembezi Mfune, and Lily Banda-Maliro
For Office Use Only X _____	

CATEGORY	YES	NO	COMMENTS
VALIDITY			
Is there a direct relationship between the program activity and what is being measured? If not, explain connection to the result.	X		Since some of the indicator data uses national data disaggregated by implementation districts, there is some question about the direct link between USAID–supported implementation and indicator data.
Can the result be plausibly attributed to USG assistance?	X		Since some of the indicator data use national data disaggregated by implementation districts, there is some question about the direct link between USAID–supported implementation and indicator data.
Are the people collecting data qualified and properly supervised?	X-		For the indicator for which MSH was the primary source (number of people trained in DOTS with USG funding), the data meet this standard. However, because much of the data reported for the FY2007 OP Indicators was derived from National MOH data disaggregated for the implementation districts, further investigation should be conducted to determine the reliability of the data. This is not to question reliability but merely to indicate that the DQA did not investigate the primary source of data.
Are steps taken to correct known data errors?	X-		
Were known data collection problems appropriately assessed?	X-		
Are steps being taken to limit transcription error?	X-		
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?		X	
RELIABILITY			
Is a consistent data collection process used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source?	X		
Are there procedures in place for periodic review of data collection, maintenance, and documentation in writing?	X		
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?		X	
TIMELINESS			
Is a regularized schedule of data collection in place to meet program management needs?	X		
Are data properly stored and readily available?	X		

PRECISION			
Is there a method for detecting duplicate data?			For the indicator for which MSH was the primary source (number of people trained in DOTS with USG funding), the data meet this standard. However, because much of the data reported for the FY2007 OP Indicators was derived from National MOH data disaggregated for the implementation districts, further investigation should be conducted to determine the reliability of the data. This is not to question reliability but merely to indicate that the DQA did not investigate the primary source of data.
Is there a method for detecting missing data?		X	
INTEGRITY			
Are there proper safeguards in place to prevent unauthorized changes to the data?			For the indicator for which MSH was the primary source (Number of people trained in DOTS with USG funding), the data meet this standard. However, because much of the data reported for the FY2007 OP Indicators was derived from National MOH data disaggregated for the implementation districts, further investigation should be conducted to determine the reliability of the data. This is not to question reliability but merely to indicate that the DQA did not investigate the primary source of data.
Is there a need for an independent review of results reported?	X		

IF NO RELEVANT DATA WERE AVAILABLE	COMMENTS
If no recent relevant data are available for this indicator, why not?	
What concrete actions are now being undertaken to collect and report these data as soon as possible?	
When will data be reported?	

SUMMARY	COMMENTS
Based on the assessment relative to the five standards, what is the overall conclusion regarding the quality of the data?	Data appear to meet the five standards but the dependence on national data makes data quality somewhat questionable
Significance of limitations (if any):	
Actions needed to address limitations (given level of USAID control over data):	An attempt should be made to disaggregate results that can be attributed to USAID interventions from national data.

USAID/MALAWI DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	INVESTING IN PEOPLE
Area:	11. Health
Element:	11.3 Malaria
Indicator title:	11. 3.1 Number of ITNs distributed that were purchased or subsidized with USG support
Is this a standard or custom indicator? If standard, make sure the title matches the title in the Indicator Handbooks.	__X_ Standard _____Custom
Data source(s):	_____ Survey/KAP __X_ Implementing partner reports _____ Other (Be specific)
USAID control over data:	_____ High (USAID is source and/or funds data collection) _X Medium (Implementing partner is data source) _____ Low (Data are from a secondary source)
Partner or contractor who provided the data (if applicable):	Population Services International
Year or period for which the data are being reported:	October 1, 2006, to September 30, 2007
Data assessment methodology:	The GH Tech team, Archanjel Chinkunda, USAID/Malawi M&E officer, and Humphreys Shumba, CTO, visited the Population Services International (PSI) offices, where John Justino, Resident Director; Alfred Zulu, Director of Administration; Michael Kainga, Internal Auditor; and Andrew Miller, Director of Communications, briefed us on the PSI program and its performance management practices. The team reviewed the partner PMP with particular emphasis on indicators and the evidence used to determine whether they have been achieved. The team assessed the linkage between the partner's and USAID/Malawi's PMPs. The team crosschecked the partner's data collection methodology against the USAID-approved methodology as reflected in the DQA checklists. The team crosschecked partner and SO PMP indicators against indicators in the USAID/Malawi Operational Plan. The team selectively spot-checked the partner's files for base documents and documentation of the evidence demonstrating achievement of the indicator (e.g., sales records, warehouse stocking levels, and sales representative reports). (The team also spot-checked approximately 30 shops in Blantyre, Zomba, and rural marketing centers to see if one could buy condoms, oral

USAID/MALAWI DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	INVESTING IN PEOPLE
	rehydration salts, WaterLite, and ITNs. Condoms, ORT, and WaterLite were available in almost all the shops. The larger shops, approximately one in ten, had the ITNs.) The team spot-checked operational manuals to confirm the existence of written procedures. A DQA checklist was prepared on the common indicators that PSI is responsible for reporting on. Using the checklist as the point of departure, the team checked data from the partners for validity, reliability, precision, timeliness, and integrity. Validity was determined by checking for consistent application of the same criteria, formulas, and procedures at all levels of the process. Reliability was checked by determining if the partner used the same data collection methods from year to year. Precision was checked by matching of indicators with actual operations. The team checked timeliness by reviewing quarterly reports to determine the period in which data were was reported, from field sites to partner, and from partner to USAID/Malawi. The team reviewed PSI spot-checking procedures to determine if those procedures are adequate to determined Integrity.
Date(s) of Assessment:	November 5, 2007
Assessment Team Members:	Archanjel Chinkunda, Humphreys Shumba , and Norman L. Olsen
For Office Use Only X _____	

CATEGORY	YES	NO	COMMENTS
VALIDITY			
Is there a direct relationship between the program activity and what is being measured? If not, explain connection to the result.	X		The indicators accurately measure the effectiveness of the PSI sales program in all aspects of health PSI is addressing.
Can the result be plausibly attributed to USG assistance?	X		Without USAID assistance, PSI would not be able to implement its health sales program.
Are the people collecting data qualified and properly supervised?	X		At all levels the PSI personnel are highly qualified, effectively trained, and aggressively supervised.
Are steps taken to correct known data errors?	X		There is an extensive system of crosschecking. There is a financial penalty for persons committing errors in recording data.
Were known data collection problems appropriately assessed?	X		PSI has extensive experience in social marketing and is well aware of the difficulties in collecting accurate data. Its procedures, with extensive crosschecking and field verification effectively address these issues.
Are steps being taken to limit transcription error?	X		Crosschecking effectively addresses any transcription error issues.
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?		X	
RELIABILITY			
Is a consistent data collection process used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source?	X		Procedures for data collection have been consistent since the project began.
Are there procedures in place for periodic review of data collection, maintenance and documented in writing?	X		PSI reviews the data quarterly. Written procedures are in place.
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?		X	
TIMELINESS			
Is a regularized schedule of data collection in place to meet program management needs?	X		The schedule of data collection, from weekly sales reports to comprehensive quarterly reports, is fully adequate for management purposes.
Are data properly stored and readily available?	X		Data are stored on site. A CD with the data is transmitted to PSI – Washington.
PRECISION			
Is there a method for detecting duplicate data?	X		The extensive crosschecking, for example balancing stocking and sales reports monthly, effectively avoids most issues of duplicate data.
Is there a method for detecting missing data?	X		See above. The team also notes that the Financial Officer does a monthly physical verification.

INTEGRITY			
Are there proper safeguards in place to prevent unauthorized changes to the data?	X		Only authorized PSI personnel have access to the raw data.
Is there a need for an independent review of results reported?		X	PSI/Washington conducts an annual program assessment.

IF NO RELEVANT DATA WERE AVAILABLE	COMMENTS
If no recent relevant data are available for this indicator, why not?	NA
What concrete actions are now being undertaken to collect and report these data as soon as possible?	
When will data be reported?	

SUMMARY	COMMENTS
Based on the assessment relative to the five standards, what is the overall conclusion regarding the quality of the data?	The data collected by PSI meet USAID standards for management and reporting.
Significance of limitations (if any):	The data being collected are of high quality but generally do not measure impact.
Actions needed to address limitations (given level of USAID control over data):	The PSI program appears to be a model for excellent data collection. The team recommends that USAID/Malawi closely examine the system of crosschecks to determine if there are best practices that other programs could effectively use.

USAID/MALAWI DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	INVESTING IN PEOPLE
Area:	Health
Element:	Malaria
Indicator title:	Number of ITNS distributed that were purchased or subsidized with USG support. Number of Artemisinin–based Combination Treatments (ACTs) purchased and distributed through USG support.
Is this a standard or custom indicator? If standard, make sure the title matches the title in the Indicator Handbooks.	__x_ Standard _____Custom
Data source(s):	_____ Survey/KAP ___x_ Implementing partner reports _____ Other (Be specific)

USAID/MALAWI DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	INVESTING IN PEOPLE
USAID control over data:	_____ High (USAID is source and/or funds data collection) __x_ Medium (Implementing partner is data source) _____ Low (Data are from a secondary source)
Partner or contractor who provided the data (if applicable)	UNICEF
Year or period for which the data are being reported	FY 2007
Data assessment methodology	Norman L. Olsen of the GH Tech team and Archanjel Chinkunda, USAID/Malawi M&E officer, visited the UNICEF offices, where Ketema Bizuneh, Chief of the Child Health Unit, briefed us on the UNICEF malaria prevention and treatment program. The team reviewed the UNICEF PMP with particular emphasis on the indicators and the evidence used to determine whether they have been achieved. The team assessed the linkage between the UNICEF and USAID/Malawi's PMPs. The team cross- checked the partner's data collection methodology against the USAID- approved methodology as reflected in the DQA checklists. The team crosschecked partner and SO PMP indicators against those in the USAID/Malawi OP. The team selectively spot-checked UNICEF files for base documents and documentation of the evidence demonstrating achievement of the indicator. The team spot-checked operational manuals to confirm the existence of written procedures. A DQA checklist was prepared on the common indicators that UNICEF is responsible for reporting on. Using the DQA assessment checklist as the point of departure, the team checked data from the partners for validity, reliability, precision, timeliness, and integrity. Validity was determined by checking for consistent application of the same criteria, formulas, and procedures at all levels of the process. The team checked reliability by determining if the partner used the same data collection methods from year to year. The team checked timeliness by reviewing quarterly reports to determine the period in which data were reported, from field sites to partner, and from partner to USAID/Malawi. The team reviewed UNICEF procedures, to determine if those procedures are adequate to determined integrity.
Date(s) of assessment:	November 9, 2007
Assessment team members:	Archanjel Chinkunda and Norman L. Olsen

USAID/MALAWI DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	INVESTING IN PEOPLE
For Office Use Only X _____	

CATEGORY	YES	NO	COMMENTS
VALIDITY			
Is there a direct relationship between the program activity and what is being measured? If not, explain connection to the result.	X		The UNICEF program financed by USAID purchases commodities for the GOM to distribute through government channels. These indicators accurately measure the scope of that program.
Can the result be plausibly attributed to USG assistance?	X		Without USAID support, the program's scope would be significantly smaller.
Are the people collecting data qualified and properly supervised?	X		The UNICEF personnel doing the purchasing and providing the logistics are well qualified and properly supervised. UNICEF also provides training to village workers in maintaining supply registries.
Are steps taken to correct known data errors?	X		The team notes that UNICEF uses multiple sources of data, which tends to reduce the amount of error. There is adequate cross-checking of data to detect and correct errors
Were known data collection problems appropriately assessed?	X		UNICEF has accurately accessed the difficulties and challenges of developing and maintaining a malaria supply chain to the GOM.
Are steps being taken to limit transcription error?	x		There is some difficulty with transcription error, although for the most part it resides on the GOM side of the operation. Transcription error appears to be within acceptable tolerances for a program of this type.
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?	X		Several documents adequately describe data quality issues and efforts to address those issues.
RELIABILITY			
Is a consistent data collection process used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source?	X		Procedures have been stable since the beginning of the activity and meet international standards.
Are there procedures in place for periodic review of data collection, maintenance, and documentation in writing?	X		UNICEF regularly reviews program data as part of on–going management. Quarterly reports document those reviews.
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?	X		See above

TIMELINESS			
Is a regularized schedule of data collection in place to meet program management needs?	X		UNICEF collects data at each step of the supply process, from initial purchase to final distribution.
Are data properly stored and readily available?	X		Data are stored at the GOM Central Statistical Office.
PRECISION			
Is there a method for detecting duplicate data?	X		Procedures are in place to avoid double-counting commodities
Is there a method for detecting missing data?	X		Crosschecking of each step in the process detects most missing data.
INTEGRITY			
Are there proper safeguards in place to prevent unauthorized changes to the data?	X		UNICEF follows the procedures established by the Central Statistical Office.
Is there a need for an independent review of results reported?		X	Overall evaluations of the health sector and comprehensive malaria program suffice.

IF NO RELEVANT DATA WERE AVAILABLE	COMMENTS
If no recent relevant data are available for this indicator, why not?	NA
What concrete actions are now being undertaken to collect and report these data as soon as possible?	
When will data be reported?	

SUMMARY	COMMENTS
Based on the assessment relative to the five standards, what is the overall conclusion regarding the quality of the data?	The data meets USAID standards for managing and reporting on this program.
Significance of limitations (if any):	The limitations are mainly in the GOM handling and distribution of the commodities.
Actions needed to address limitations (given level of USAID control over data):	Normal managerial oversight

USAID/MALAWI DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	INVESTING IN PEOPLE
Area:	11. Health
Element:	11.3 Malaria
Indicator Title:	11. 3.6 Number of improvements to laws, policies, regulations, or guidelines related to improved access to use of health services with USG support 11. 3.21 Number of evaluations conducted by the USG (Process/results/impact/other) 11. 3.21 Number of information- gathering or research activities conducted by the USG
Is this a standard or custom indicator? If standard, make sure the title matches the title in the Indicator Handbooks.	_x__ Standard _____Custom
Data source(s):	_____ Survey/KAP __x__ Implementing partner reports _____ Other (Be specific)
USAID control over data:	_____ High (USAID is source and/or funds data collection) __x_ Medium (Implementing partner is data source) _____ Low (Data are from a secondary source)
Partner or contractor who provided the data (if applicable):	CDC/Malaria Alert Center
Year or period for which the data are being reported:	October 1, 2006, to September 30, 2007
Data assessment methodology:	The GH Tech team, Archanjel Chinkunda, USAID/Malawi M&E Officer, and Phyles Kachingwe, CTO, visited the CDC/Malaria Alert Center Program. The team was briefed by Carl Campbell, Chief of Party for the Program, and Nyson Chizani, Data Management Specialist. The team obtained an overview of the CDC/Malaria Alert Program and its performance management practices. The team reviewed the partner PMP, indicators, and the evidence used to determine whether indicators are achieved. The team assessed the linkage between the partner's and USAID/Malawi's PMPs. The team crosschecked the partner's data collection methodology against the USAID-approved methodology as reflected in the DQA checklists. The team crosschecked partner and SO PMP indicators against those in the USAID/Malawi OP. The team selectively spot-checked the partner's files for base documents and documentation of the evidence

USAID/MALAWI DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	INVESTING IN PEOPLE
	demonstrating achievement of the indicator results, such as Portable Data Assistants used for data collection. The team also spot-checked operational manuals to confirm the existence of written procedures. A DQA checklist was prepared on the common indicators that the CDC/Malaria Program is responsible for reporting on. Using the checklist as the point of departure, the team checked the data from the partners for validity, reliability, precision, timeliness, and integrity. Validity was determined by checking for consistent application of the same criteria, formulas, and procedures at all levels of the process. Reliability was checked by determining if the partner used the same data collection methods from year to year. Precision was checked by comparing indicators with actual operations. The team checked timeliness by reviewing quarterly reports to determine the period in which data were reported, from field sites to partner, and from partner to USAID/Malawi. The team reviewed CDC/Malaria Program spot-checking procedures to determine if those procedures are adequate to determine integrity.
Date(s) of assessment:	November 6, 2007
Assessment team members:	Archanjel Chinkunda, Phyles Kachingwe, and Norman L. Olsen
For Office Use Only X _____	

CATEGORY	YES	NO	COMMENTS
VALIDITY			
Is there a direct relationship between the program activity and what is being measured? If not, explain connection to the result.	X		The three indicators for the CDC/Malaria Program accurately measure the progress being made on the malaria alert program.
Can the result be plausibly attributed to USG assistance?	X		Without USAID assistance, this activity and the progress it is achieving would not be taking place.
Are the people collecting data qualified and properly supervised?	X		The Data Management Specialist closely supervises data collection, in all its elements. That person also trains enumerators for the surveys done by the project. For example, enumerators are trained in use of PDA tools for data collection.
Are steps taken to correct known data errors?	X		All data are carefully reviewed and any detected errors corrected.

Were known data collection problems appropriately assessed?			Surveys are typically the technique of choice for most data collection in this project. The techniques used conform to acceptable international practice.
Are steps being taken to limit transcription error?	X		The program uses a system of internal checks whereby the Chief of Party and the Data Management Specialist thoroughly review any reports for transcription or other errors.
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?		X	
RELIABILITY			
Is a consistent data collection process used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source?	X		Basic procedures have been stable since the beginning of the program.
Are there procedures in place for periodic review of data collection, maintenance, and documentation in writing?	X		Data are periodically reviewed, especially in preparing reports to USAID. Written procedures are in place to guide data collection, review, and maintenance.
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?		X	
TIMELINESS			
Is a regularized schedule of data collection in place to meet program management needs?	X		Data are regularly collected and meet the management needs of the program.
Are data properly stored and readily available?	X		Data are stored on site, backed up in multiple computers, and sent to CDC.
PRECISION			
Is there a method for detecting duplicate data?	X		In general, the use of surveys in conjunction with GPS techniques substantially reduces the risk of duplicate data.
Is there a method for detecting missing data?	X		All data are thoroughly reviewed to detect any missing elements.
INTEGRITY			
Are there proper safeguards in place to prevent unauthorized changes to the data?	X		The program has relatively open access to the data. However, there is little incentive for anyone to make unauthorized changes to the data. In addition, the use of the local area network (LAN) and password protection prevent unauthorized changes.
Is there a need for an independent review of results reported?		X	The evaluations made on the program effectively serve as independent review.

IF NO RELEVANT DATA WERE AVAILABLE	COMMENTS
If no recent relevant data are available for this indicator, why not?	NA
What concrete actions are now being	

undertaken to collect and report these data as soon as possible?	
When will data be reported?	

SUMMARY	COMMENTS
Based on the assessment relative to the five standards, what is the overall conclusion regarding the quality of the data?	The data meet USAID quality standards for management and reporting. The program should maintain the quality of the data.
Significance of limitations (if any):	See above
Actions needed to address limitations (given level of USAID control over data):	USAID/Malawi should closely monitor the situation to ensure that data collection quality and management are maintained.

USAID/MALAWI DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	INVESTING IN PEOPLE
Area:	11. Health
Element:	11.3 Malaria
Indicator title:	11. 3.3 Number of people trained in malaria treatment or prevention with USG funds (SD)
Is this a standard or custom indicator? If standard, make sure the title matches the title in the Indicator Handbooks.	__X_ Standard _____Custom
Data source(s):	_____ Survey/KAP __X__ Implementing partner reports _____ Other (Be specific)
USAID control over data:	_____ High (USAID is source and/or funds data collection) X _Medium (Implementing partner is data source) _____ Low (Data are from a secondary source)
Partner or contractor who provided the data (if applicable)	JHPIEGO, a nonprofit affiliate of John Hopkins University
Year or period for which the data are being reported	October 1, 2006, to September 30, 2007
Data assessment methodology:	A DQA checklist was prepared on the common indicators that JHPIEO is responsible for reporting on. Using the checklist as the point of departure, the team checked the data from the partners for validity, reliability,

USAID/MALAWI DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	INVESTING IN PEOPLE
	precision, timeliness, and integrity. Validity was determined by checking for consistent application of the same criteria, formulas, and procedures at all levels of the process. Reliability was checked by determining if the partner used the same data collection methods from year to year. Precision was checked by comparing indicators with actual operations. The team checked timeliness by reviewing quarterly reports to determine the period in which data were reported from field sites to partner and from partner to USAID/Malawi. The team reviewed JHPIEGO spot-checking procedures to determine if those procedures are adequate to determined integrity.
Date(s) of assessment:	October 30, 2007
Assessment team members:	Barry Silverman, Norman L. Olsen, Archanjel Chinkunda
For Office Use Only X _____	

CATEGORY	YES	NO	COMMENTS
VALIDITY			
Is there a direct relationship between the program activity and what is being measured? If not, explain connection to the result.	X		There is a direct relationship between JHPIEGO's activities and the data reported.
Can the result be plausibly attributed to USG assistance?	X		The results would not have been accomplished without USAID support.
Are the people collecting data qualified and properly supervised?	X		At all levels JHPIEGO personnel are highly qualified, effectively trained, and aggressively supervised in data management.
Are steps taken to correct known data errors?	X		There is an extensive system of crosschecking. Their procedures, with extensive crosschecking and field verification, effectively address the issues of data collection and reporting.
Were known data collection problems appropriately assessed?	X		Spot-checks are employed to address any data collection problems. Problems are corrected if found.
Are steps being taken to limit transcription error?	X		Crosschecking effectively addresses transcription error issues.
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?	X		

RELIABILITY			
Is a consistent data collection process used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source?	X		JHPIEGO uses well-established processes that are consistent in time and location.
Are there procedures in place for periodic review of data collection, maintenance, and documentation in writing?	X		JHPIEGO uses well-documented procedures for data collection, analysis, and reporting.
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?		X	
TIMELINESS			
Is a regularized schedule of data collection in place to meet program management needs?	X		Data are collected, analyzed, and reported in a timely fashion.
Are data properly stored and readily available?	X		JHPIEGO maintains secured databases for indicator data.
PRECISION			
Is there a method for detecting duplicate data?	X		Extensive crosschecking and spot-checking detect any duplicate data, which does not appear to be a problem.
Is there a method for detecting missing data?	X		Extensive crosschecking and spot-checking detect any missing data, which does not appear to be a problem.
INTEGRITY			
Are there proper safeguards in place to prevent unauthorized changes to the data?	X		Only authorized staff have access to data.
Is there a need for an independent review of results reported?	X		

IF NO RELEVANT DATA WERE AVAILABLE	COMMENTS
If no recent relevant data are available for this indicator, why not?	NA
What concrete actions are now being undertaken to collect and report these data as soon as possible?	
When will data be reported?	

SUMMARY	COMMENTS
Based on the assessment relative to the five standards, what is the overall conclusion regarding the quality of the data?	Data meet the five data quality standards.
Significance of limitations (if any):	NA
Actions needed to address limitations (given level of USAID control over data):	NA

USAID/MALAWI DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	INVESTING IN PEOPLE
Area:	11. Health
Element:	11.6 Maternal and child health
Indicator title:	11. 6.1 Number of postpartum/newborn visits within 3 days of birth in USG-assisted programs 11. 6.2 Number of antenatal care (ANC) visits by skilled providers from USG-assisted facilities 11. 6.3 Number of people trained in maternal and/or newborn health through USG-supported programs (SD) 11. 6.6 Number of women giving birth who received AMSTL through USG-supported programs 11. 6.8 Number of newborns receiving essential newborn care through USG-supported programs 11. 6.6 Number of improvements to laws, policies, regulations, or guidelines related to improved access to and use of health services drafted with USG support
Is this a standard or custom Indicator? If standard, make sure the title matches the title in the Indicator Handbooks.	__X_ Standard _____Custom
Data source(s):	_____ Survey/KAP __X__ Implementing partner reports _____ Other (Be specific)
USAID control over data:	_____ High (USAID is source and/or funds data collection) X _Medium (Implementing partner is data source) _____ Low (Data are from a secondary source)
Partner or contractor who provided the data (if applicable)	JHPIEGO, a nonprofit affiliate of Johns Hopkins University
Year or period for which the data are being reported	October 1, 2006, to September 30, 2007
Data assessment methodology:	A DQA checklist was prepared on the common indicators that JHPIEO is responsible for reporting on. Using the checklist as the point of departure, the team checked the data from the partners for validity, reliability, precision, timeliness, and integrity. Validity was determined by checking for consistent application of the same criteria, formulas, and procedures at all levels of the process. Reliability was checked by determining if the

USAID/MALAWI DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	INVESTING IN PEOPLE
	partner used the same data collection methods from year to year. Precision was checked by comparing indicators with actual operations. The team checked timeliness by reviewing quarterly reports to determine the period in which data were reported from field sites to partner and from partner to USAID/Malawi. The team reviewed JHPIEGO program spot-checking procedures to determine if those procedures are adequate to determine integrity.
Date(s) of assessment:	October 30, 2007
Assessment team members:	Barry Silverman, Norman L. Olsen, Archanjel Chinkunda
For Office Use Only	

CATEGORY	YES	NO	COMMENTS
VALIDITY			
Is there a direct relationship between the program activity and what is being measured? If not, explain connection to the result.	X		There is a direct relationship between JHPIEGO's activities and the data reported.
Can the result be plausibly attributed to USG assistance?	X		The results would not have been accomplished without USAID support.
Are the people collecting data qualified and properly supervised?	X		At all levels JHPIEGO personnel are highly qualified, effectively trained, and aggressively supervised in data management.
Are steps taken to correct known data errors?	X		There is an extensive system of crosschecking. The procedures, with extensive crosschecking and field verification, effectively address the issues of data collection and reporting.
Were known data collection problems appropriately assessed?	X		Spot-checks are employed to address data collection problems. Problems are corrected if found.
Are steps being taken to limit transcription error?	X		Crosschecking effectively addresses any transcription error issues.
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?	X		
RELIABILITY			
Is a consistent data collection process used from year to year, location to	X		JHPIEGO uses well-established processes that are consistent for time and location.

location, data source to data source?			
Are there procedures in place for periodic review of data collection, maintenance, and documentation in writing?	X		JHPIEGO uses well-documented procedures for data collection, analysis, and reporting.
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?		X	
TIMELINESS			
Is a regularized schedule of data collection in place to meet program management needs?	X		Data are collected, analyzed, and reported in a timely fashion.
Are data properly stored and readily available?	X		JHPIEGO maintains secured databases for indicator data.
PRECISION			
Is there a method for detecting duplicate data?	X		Extensive crosschecking and spot-checking detect any duplicate data, which does not appear to be a problem.
Is there a method for detecting missing data?	X		Extensive crosschecking and spot-checking detect any missing data, which does not appear to be a problem.
INTEGRITY			
Are there proper safeguards in place to prevent unauthorized changes to the data?	X		Only authorized staff have access to data.
Is there a need for an independent review of results reported?	X		

IF NO RELEVANT DATA WERE AVAILABLE	COMMENTS
If no recent relevant data are available for this indicator, why not?	NA
What concrete actions are now being undertaken to collect and report these data as soon as possible?	
When will data be reported?	

SUMMARY	COMMENTS
Based on the assessment relative to the five standards, what is the overall conclusion regarding the quality of the data?	Data meet the five data quality standards.
Significance of limitations (if any):	
Actions needed to address limitations (given level of USAID control over data):	

USAID/MALAWI DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	INVESTING IN PEOPLE
Area:	11. Health
Element:	11.7 Family planning and reproductive health
Indicator title:	11. 7.2 Number of people trained in FP/RH with USG funds (SD) 11. 7.3 Number of counseling visits for FP/RH as a result of USG assistance (SD) 11. 7.5 Number of policies or guidelines developed or changed with USG assistance to improve access to and use of FP/RH services 11. 7.7 Number of USG-assisted service delivery points providing FP counseling or services
Is this a standard or custom Indicator? If standard, make sure the title matches the title in the Indicator Handbooks.	__X_ Standard _____Custom
Data source(s):	_____ Survey/KAP __X__ Implementing partner reports _____ Other (Be specific)
USAID control over data:	_____ High (USAID is source and/or funds data collection) X _Medium (Implementing partner is data source) _____ Low (Data are from a secondary source)
Partner or contractor who provided the data (if applicable):	JHPIEGO, a nonprofit affiliate of John Hopkins University
Year or period for which the data are being reported:	October 1, 2006, to September 30, 2007
Data assessment methodology:	A DQA checklist was prepared on the common indicators that JHPIEGO is responsible for reporting on. Using the checklist as the point of departure, the team checked the data from the partners for validity, reliability, precision, timeliness, and integrity. Validity was determined by checking for consistent application of the same criteria, formulas, and procedures at all levels of the process. Reliability was checked by determining if the partner used the same data collection methods from year to year. Precision was checked by comparing indicators with actual operations. The team checked timeliness by reviewing quarterly reports to determine the period in which data were reported from field sites to partner and from partner to USAID/Malawi. The team reviewed

USAID/MALAWI DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	INVESTING IN PEOPLE
	JHPIEGO program spot-checking procedures to determine if those procedures are adequate to determine integrity.
Date(s) of assessment:	October 30, 2007
Assessment team members:	Barry Silverman, Norman L. Olsen, Archanjel Chinkunda
For Office Use Only _____	

CATEGORY	YES	NO	COMMENTS
VALIDITY			
Is there a direct relationship between the program activity and what is being measured? If not, explain connection to the result.	X		There is a direct relationship between JHPIEGO's activities and the data reported.
Can the result be plausibly attributed to USG assistance?	X		The results would not have been accomplished without USAID support.
Are the people collecting data qualified and properly supervised?	X		At all levels JHPIEGO personnel are highly qualified, effectively trained, and aggressively supervised in data management.
Are steps taken to correct known data errors?	X		There is an extensive system of crosschecking. The procedures, with extensive crosschecking and field verification, effectively address the issues of data collection and reporting.
Were known data collection problems appropriately assessed?	X		Spot-checks are employed to address any data collection problems. Problems are corrected if found.
Are steps being taken to limit transcription error?	X		Crosschecking effectively addresses any transcription error issues.
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?	X		
RELIABILITY			
Is a consistent data collection process used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source?	X		JHPIEGO uses well-established processes that have been consistent in terms of time and location since the beginning of the program.
Are there procedures in place for periodic review of data collection, maintenance, and documentation in writing?	X		JHPIEGO uses well-documented procedures for data collection, analysis, and reporting.
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?		X	

TIMELINESS			
Is a regularized schedule of data collection in place to meet program management needs?	X		Data are collected, analyzed, and reported in a timely fashion.
Are data properly stored and readily available?	X		JHPIEGO maintains secured databases for indicator data.
PRECISION			
Is there a method for detecting duplicate data?	X		Extensive crosschecking and spot-checking detect any duplicate data, which does not appear to be a problem.
Is there a method for detecting missing data?	X		Extensive crosschecking and spot-checking detect any missing data, which does not appear to be a problem.
INTEGRITY			
Are there proper safeguards in place to prevent unauthorized changes to the data?	X		Only authorized staff have access to data.
Is there a need for an independent review of results reported?	X		

IF NO RELEVANT DATA WERE AVAILABLE	COMMENTS
If no recent relevant data are available for this indicator, why not?	NA
What concrete actions are now being undertaken to collect and report these data as soon as possible?	
When will data be reported?	

SUMMARY	COMMENTS
Based on the assessment relative to the five standards, what is the overall conclusion regarding the quality of the data?	Data meet the five data quality standards.
Significance of limitations (if any):	
Actions needed to address limitations (given level of USAID control over data):	

USAID/MALAWI DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	INVESTING IN PEOPLE
Area:	11. Health
Element:	11.3 Malaria
Indicator title:	11. 3.3 Number of people trained in malaria treatment or prevention with USG funds (SD) 11. 3.5 Number of artemisinin-based combination treatments (ACTs) purchased and distributed with USG support 11. 3.6 Number of improvements to laws, policies, regulations, or guidelines related to improved access to and use of health services drafted with USG support 11. 3.8 Number of USG-assisted service delivery points experiencing stock-outs of specific tracer drugs
Is this a standard or custom indicator? If standard, make sure the title matches the title in the Indicator Handbooks.	__X_ Standard _____Custom
Data source(s):	_____ Survey/KAP __X__ Implementing partner reports _____ Other (Be specific)
USAID control over data:	_____ High (USAID is source and/or funds data collection) X _Medium (Implementing partner is data source) _____ Low (Data are from a secondary source)
Partner or contractor who provided the data (if applicable):	Management Sciences for Health—MSH/BASICS
Year or period for which the data are being reported:	October 1, 2006, to September 30, 2007
Data assessment methodology:	A DQA checklist was prepared on the common indicators that MSH is responsible for reporting on. Using the checklist as the point of departure, the team checked the data from the partner for validity, reliability, precision, timeliness, and integrity. Validity was determined by checking for consistent application of the same criteria, formulas, and procedures at all levels of the process. Reliability was checked by determining if the partner used the same data collection methods from year to year. Precision was checked by comparing indicators with actual operations. The team checked timeliness by reviewing quarterly reports to determine the period in which data were reported, from field sites to partner, and

USAID/MALAWI DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	INVESTING IN PEOPLE
	from partner to USAID/Malawi. The team reviewed MSH spot-checking procedures to determine if those procedures are adequate to determine integrity.
Date(s) of assessment:	October 31, 2007
Assessment team members:	Barry Silverman, Norman L. Olsen, Archanjel Chinkunda
For Office Use Only _____	

CATEGORY	YES	NO	COMMENTS
VALIDITY			
Is there a direct relationship between the program activity and what is being measured? If not, explain connection to the result.	X		
Can the result be plausibly attributed to USG assistance?	X		
Are the people collecting data qualified and properly supervised?	X-		There is a need for more supervision at all levels
Are steps taken to correct known data errors?	X-		Follow-up needs to be more aggressive
Were known data collection problems appropriately assessed?	X		
Are steps being taken to limit transcription error?		X	There has been no regular examination of transcription errors.
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?		X	
RELIABILITY			
Is a consistent data collection process used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source?	X		Project is transitioning from MSH Project to BASICS and attention should be paid to the transition of data management processes.
Are there procedures in place for periodic review of data collection, maintenance, and documentation in writing?	X		
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?		X	

TIMELINESS			
Is a regularized schedule of data collection in place to meet program management needs?	X		
Are data properly stored and readily available?	X		
PRECISION			
Is there a method for detecting duplicate data?	X		
Is there a method for detecting missing data?	X		
INTEGRITY			
Are there proper safeguards in place to prevent unauthorized changes to the data?	X		Only M&E staff have access.
Is there a need for an independent review of results reported?		X	

IF NO RELEVANT DATA WERE AVAILABLE	COMMENTS
If no recent relevant data are available for this indicator, why not?	NA
What concrete actions are now being undertaken to collect and report these data as soon as possible?	
When will data be reported?	

SUMMARY	COMMENTS
Based on the assessment relative to the five standards, what is the overall conclusion regarding the quality of the data?	Data meet the five standards so far but close attention should be paid to BASICS data management processes.
Significance of limitations (if any):	

USAID/NAME DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	INVESTING IN PEOPLE
Area:	11. Health
Element:	11.3 Malaria
Indicator title:	11. 3.1 Number of ITNs distributed that were purchased or subsidized with USG support
Is this a standard or custom indicator? If standard, make sure the title matches the title in the Indicator Handbooks.	__X_ Standard _____Custom
Data source(s):	_____ Survey/KAP __X_ Implementing partner reports _____ Other (Be specific)
USAID control over data:	_____ High (USAID is source and/or funds data collection) _X Medium (Implementing partner is data source) _____ Low (Data are from a secondary source)
Partner or contractor who provided the data (if applicable):	Population Services International (PSI)
Year or period for which the data are being reported:	October 1, 2006, to September 30, 2007
Data assessment methodology:	The GH Tech team, Archanjel Chinkunda, USAID/Malawi M&E officer, and Humphreys Shumba, CTO, visited the PSI offices, where John Justino, Resident Director; Alfred Zulu, Director of Administration; Michael Kainga, Internal Auditor; and Andrew Miller, Director of Communications, briefed us on the program and its performance management practices. The team reviewed the PSI PMP with particular emphasis on indicators and the evidence used to determine whether they have been achieved. The team assessed the linkage between the PSI and USAID/Malawi PMPs. The team crosschecked the partner's data collection methodology against the USAID-approved methodology as reflected in the DQA checklists. The team crosschecked partner and SO PMP indicators against indicators in the USAID/Malawi OP. The team selectively spot-checked the partner's files for base documents and documentation of the evidence demonstrating achievement of the indicator (e.g., sales records, warehouse stocking levels, and sales representative reports). The team also spot- checked approximately 30 shops in Blantyre, Zomba, and rural marketing centers to see if one could buy condoms, oral rehydration salts, WaterLite, and ITNs. Condoms, ORT, and WaterLite were available in almost all the shops. The

	larger shops, approximately one in ten, had the ITNs. The team spot-checked operational manuals to confirm the existence of written procedures. A DQA checklist was prepared on the common indicators that PSI is responsible for reporting on. Using the checklist as the point of departure, the team checked data from the partners for validity, reliability, precision, timeliness, and integrity. Validity was determined by checking for consistent application of the same criteria, formulas, and procedures at all levels of the process. Reliability was checked by determining if the partner used the same data collection methods from year to year. Precision was checked by comparing indicators with actual operations. The team checked timeliness by reviewing quarterly reports to determine the period in which data were reported from field sites to partner and from partner to USAID/Malawi. The team reviewed PSI spot-checking procedures to determine if they are adequate to determine integrity.
Date(s) of Assessment:	November 5, 2007
Assessment Team Members:	Archanjel Chinkunda, Humphreys Shumba , and Norman L. Olsen
For Office Use Only _____	

CATEGORY	YES	NO	COMMENTS
VALIDITY			
Is there a direct relationship between the program activity and what is being measured? If not, explain connection to the result.	x		The indicators accurately measure the effectiveness of the PSI sales program in all aspects of health PSI is addressing.
Can the result be plausibly attributed to USG assistance?	x		Without USAID assistance, PSI would not be able to implement its health sales program.
Are the people collecting data qualified and properly supervised?	x		At all levels PSI personnel are highly qualified, effectively trained, and aggressively supervised.
Are steps taken to correct known data errors?	x		There is an extensive system of crosschecking. There is a financial penalty for persons committing errors in recording data.
Were known data collection problems appropriately assessed?	x		PSI has extensive experience in social marketing and is well aware of the difficulties in collecting accurate data. The procedures, with extensive crosschecking and field verification, effectively address these issues.
Are steps being taken to limit transcription error?	x		Crosschecking effectively addresses any transcription error issues.

Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?		X	
RELIABILITY			
Is a consistent data collection process used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source?	x		Procedures for data collection have been consistent since the project began.
Are there procedures in place for periodic review of data collection, maintenance, and documentation in writing?	x		PSI reviews the data quarterly. Written procedures are in place.
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?		X	
TIMELINESS			
Is a regularized schedule of data collection in place to meet program management needs?	x		The schedule of data collection, from weekly sales reports to comprehensive quarterly reports, is fully adequate for management purposes.
Are data properly stored and readily available?	x		Data is stored on site. A CD with the data is transmitted to PSI—Washington,
PRECISION			
Is there a method for detecting duplicate data?	x		The extensive crosschecking, for example balancing stocking and sales reports monthly, effectively avoids most issues of duplicate data.
Is there a method for detecting missing data?	x		See above. The team also notes that the Financial Officer does a monthly physical verification.
INTEGRITY			
Are there proper safeguards in place to prevent unauthorized changes to the data?	x		Only authorized PSI personnel have access to the raw data.
Is there a need for an independent review of results reported?		X	PSI/Washington conducts an annual program assessment.

IF NO RELEVANT DATA WERE AVAILABLE	COMMENTS
If no recent relevant data are available for this indicator, why not?	NA
What concrete actions are now being undertaken to collect and report these data as soon as possible?	
When will data be reported?	

SUMMARY	COMMENTS
Based on the assessment relative to the five standards, what is the overall conclusion regarding the quality of the data?	The data collected by PSI meet USAID standards for management and reporting.
Significance of limitations (if any):	The data being collected is of high quality but it generally does not measure impact.
Actions needed to address limitations (given level of USAID control over data):	The PSI program appears to be a model for excellent data collection. The team recommends that USAID/Malawi closely examine the system of crosschecks to determine if there are best practices that other programs could effectively use.

USAID/NAME DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	INVESTING IN PEOPLE
Area:	11. Health
Element:	Family Planning and Reproductive Health (FP/RH)
Indicator Title:	Couple-years of protection (CYP) in USG-supported programs Number of persons trained in FP/RH with USG funds Number of counseling visits for FP/RH as a result of USG assistance Number of people that have seen or heard a specific FP/RH message Number of interventions providing services, counseling, and/or community-based awareness activities intended to reduce rates of gender-based violence Number of service delivery points (SDPs) providing FP counseling or services Number of service delivery points reporting stock-outs of any contraceptive commodity offered by the SDP at any point during the period.
Is this a standard or custom Indicator? If standard, make sure the title matches the title in the Indicator Handbooks.	_x__ Standard _____Custom
Data source(s):	_____ Survey/KAP __x__ Implementing partner reports _____ Other (Be specific)
USAID control over data:	_____ High (USAID is source and/or funds data collection) __x_ Medium (Implementing partner is data source) _____ Low (Data are from a secondary source)

USAID/NAME DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	INVESTING IN PEOPLE
Partner or contractor who provided the data (if applicable):	Adventist Health Services
Year or period for which the data are being reported:	March 2006 – November 2007
Data assessment methodology:	The GH Tech team and Archanjel Chinkunda, USAID/Malawi M&E officer, visited the Adventist Health Services (AHS) program, where the team was briefed by Florence Chipungu, AHS Director; Joseph Mwandira, Project Manager; Peter Kambalametore, FP Coordinator; and Dorothy Gomani, Data Entry Clerk on the AHS program and its performance management practices. The team reviewed the partner PMP with particular emphasis on the indicators and the evidence used to determine whether they have been achieved. The team assessed the linkage between the AHS and USAID/Malawi PMPs. The team crosschecked the partner's data collection methodology against the USAID-approved methodology as reflected in the DQA checklists. The team crosschecked partner and SO PMP indicators against indicators in the USAID/Malawi OP. The team selectively spot-checked the AHS files for base documents and documentation of the evidence demonstrating achievement of the indicator, e.g., looking at Community Based Distribution Agent (CBDA) tally sheets to verify activity. The team spot-checked operational manuals to confirm the existence of written procedures. A DQA checklist was prepared on the common indicators that AHS is responsible for reporting on. Using the checklist as the point of departure, the team checked data from the partners for validity, reliability, precision, timeliness, and integrity. Validity was determined by checking for consistent application of the same criteria, formulas, and procedures at all levels of the process. Reliability was checked by determining if the partner used the same data collection methods from year to year. Precision was checked by comparing actual operations with indicators. The team checked timeliness by reviewing quarterly reports to determine the period in which data were reported from field sites to partner and from partner to USAID/Malawi. The team reviewed AHS procedures, spot-checking to determine if they are adequate to determine integrity.
Date(s) of assessment:	November 7, 2007
Assessment team members:	Archanjel Chinkunda and Norman L. Olsen
For Office Use Only _____	

CATEGORY	YES	NO	COMMENTS
VALIDITY			
Is there a direct relationship between the program activity and what is being measured? If not, explain connection to the result.	x		The seven indicators accurately measure the scope of the program and its effectiveness in providing basic FP services.
Can the result be plausibly attributed to USG assistance?	x		Without USAID assistance, these services would not exist.
Are the people collecting data qualified and properly supervised?	x		Initially the CBDAs receive two weeks of training. For each year in the program, they receive an additional one-week refresher training.
Are steps taken to correct known data errors?	x		Data are reviewed at all levels and errors corrected.
Were known data collection problems appropriately assessed?	x		AHS recognizes the difficulties involved in volunteers collecting accurate data. They have installed crosschecking procedures to address those issues, in particular checking to see if the services provided balance against the commodities used.
Are steps being taken to limit transcription error?	x		AHS crosschecks transcripts against services and commodities provided.
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?		x	
RELIABILITY			
Is a consistent data collection process used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source?	x		Procedures have been stable since the beginning of the project.
Are there procedures in place for periodic review of data collection, maintenance, and documentation in writing?	x		AHS reviews data quarterly. Written procedures are in place.
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?		x	
TIMELINESS			
Is a regularized schedule of data collection in place to meet program management needs?	x		The data collection process is sufficient for AHS management purposes.
Are data properly stored and readily available?	x		Data are stored on site. They are also backed up on three separate computers and stored on CDs.
PRECISION			
Is there a method for detecting duplicate data?	x		Clients receiving services are issued an individual ID number.
Is there a method for detecting missing data?	x		Crosschecking and site visits.

INTEGRITY			
Are there proper safeguards in place to prevent unauthorized changes to the data?	x		Access to the data is password- protected.
Is there a need for an independent review of results reported?		x	

IF NO RELEVANT DATA WERE AVAILABLE	COMMENTS
If no recent relevant data are available for this indicator, why not?	NA
What concrete actions are now being undertaken to collect and report these data as soon as possible?	
When will data be reported?	

SUMMARY	COMMENTS
Based on the assessment relative to the five standards, what is the overall conclusion regarding the quality of the data?	The data meet USAID standards for management and reporting.
Significance of limitations (if any):	This is a community-based, largely volunteer implemented, program. The GH Tech team suspects the level of error in data collection and transcription is between 5% and 10%. AHS believes it is less than 5%. For this type of program, in this environment, this is acceptable for management and reporting purposes.
Actions needed to address limitations (given level of USAID control over data):	Frequent field site visits

USAID/NAME DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	INVESTING IN PEOPLE
Area:	Health
Element:	11.7 Family planning and reproductive health (FP/RH)
Indicator Title:	11. 7.3 Number of counseling visits for FP/RH as a result of USG assistance (SD) 11. 7.9 Number of service delivery points (SDPs) reporting stock-outs of any contraceptive commodity offered by the SDP at any time during the reporting period 11. 7.6 Number of new approaches successfully introduced through USG- supported programs
Is this a standard or custom indicator? If standard, make sure the title matches the title in the Indicator Handbooks.	__x_ Standard ____Custom

USAID/NAME DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	INVESTING IN PEOPLE
Data source(s):	_____ Survey/KAP __x__ Implementing partner reports _____ Other (Be specific)
USAID control over data:	_____ High (USAID is source and/or funds data collection) _x__ Medium (Implementing partner is data source) _____ Low (Data are from a secondary source)
Partner or contractor who provided the data (if applicable):	John Snow Incorporated (JSI)
Year or period for which the data are being reported:	FY 2007
Data assessment methodology:	The GH Tech team, Patrick Wesner, USAID/Malawi Program Officer, and Catherine Berkenshire-Scott, Health Team Strategic Information Liaison Advisor, visited the JSI DELIVER II Project located at the Ministry of Health (MOH) Central Medical Stores. Jayne Waweru, Country Director, and Evance Moyo and Elias Mwalabu, both Assistant Logistic Management Information Associates, briefed the team.
Date(s) of assessment:	November 2007
Assessment team members:	Barry Silverman, Patrick Wesner, Catherine Berkenshire-Scott
For Office Use Only _____	

CATEGORY	YES	NO	COMMENTS
VALIDITY			
Is there a direct relationship between the program activity and what is being measured? If not, explain connection to the result.	x		There is a data issue because of the aggregation of DELIVER I and DELIVER II data. A lack of confidence was expressed about the stock outage indicator because some service points are not correctly reporting outages.
Can the result be plausibly attributed to USG assistance?	x		
Are the people collecting data qualified and properly supervised?		X	Because of the problem with the stock outage indicator, there appears to be a problem with supervision.
Are steps taken to correct known data errors?	X		The stock outage indicator is an exception.
Were known data collection problems appropriately assessed?	X		The stock outage indicator is an exception.
Are steps being taken to limit transcription error?	X		There is crosscheck to minimize transcription errors.
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?		X	
RELIABILITY			
Is a consistent data collection process used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source?	X		This is a transition period between DELIVER I and DELIVER II, and the project has new staff. Particular attention should be paid to the transition of data collection and reporting processes.
Are there procedures in place for periodic review of data collection, maintenance and documented in writing?	X		There are well-documented procedures.
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?		X	
TIMELINESS			
Is a regularized schedule of data collection in place to meet program management needs?	X		
Are data properly stored and readily available?	X		JSI presented a specially prepared PowerPoint presentation on its Logistic Management Information System (LMIS). The system manages information at the facility, district, zone, and central levels. There are three sets of LMIS records: (1) stock-keeping records, (2) transaction records, and (3) consumption records. Community clinics report to health centers; NGO/PVO/Clinic/CHAMs report to either a health center or a district hospital, whichever is closer; district hospitals report to regional medical stores (RMS); central/ mental hospitals also report

			to RMS. RMS reports to the Central Medical Store.
PRECISION			
Is there a method for detecting duplicate data?	X		Data are spot-checked to eliminate duplicate entry.
Is there a method for detecting missing data?	X		
INTEGRITY			
Are there proper safeguards in place to prevent unauthorized changes to the data?	X		The LMIS is maintained by the DELIVER II staff.
Is there a need for an independent review of results reported?		X	

IF NO RELEVANT DATA WERE AVAILABLE	COMMENTS
If no recent relevant data are available for this indicator, why not?	NA
What concrete actions are now being undertaken to collect and report these data as soon as possible?	
When will data be reported?	

SUMMARY	COMMENTS
Based on the assessment relative to the five standards, what is the overall conclusion regarding the quality of the data?	Except for the stock outage indicator, DELIVER II inherited an outstanding logistic management system from DELIVER I; all other indicators meet the five data quality standards.
Significance of limitations (if any):	Stock outage is central to the mandate of DELIVER II.
Actions needed to address limitations (given level of USAID control over data):	Supervisory actions should be taken to rectify the stock outage indicator problem.

USAID/NAME DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	INVESTING IN PEOPLE
Area:	12. Education
Element:	12.1 Basic education
Indicator title:	12. 1.3 Number of learners enrolled in USG-supported primary schools or equivalent non-school-based settings (SD) 12.1.6 Number of teachers/ educators trained with USG support (SD)
Is this a standard or custom indicator? If standard, make sure the title matches the title in the Indicator Handbooks.	__X_ Standard ____Custom

USAID/NAME DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	INVESTING IN PEOPLE
Data source(s):	_____ Survey/KAP __X_ Implementing partner reports _____ Other (Be specific)
USAID control over data:	_____ High (USAID is source and/or funds data collection) _X Medium (Implementing partner is data source) _____ Low (Data are from a secondary source)
Partner or contractor who provided the data (if applicable):	American Institute for Research (AIR)—MTTA
Year or period for which the data are being reported:	October 1, 2006, to September 30, 2007
Data assessment methodology:	The GH Tech team, Archanjel Chinkunda, USAID/Malawi M&E officer, and Ramsey Sosola, CTO, visited the MTTA project. Simon Mawindo, Chief of Party; Dr. Hartford Mchazime Deputy Chief of Party; and Chaplain Katumbi, M&E Officer, briefed us. The team obtained an overview of the MTTA program and its performance management practices. The team reviewed the partner PMP with particular emphasis on the indicators and the evidence used to determine whether they have been achieved. The team assessed the linkage between the MTTA and USAID/Malawi PMPs. The team cross- checked the partner's data collection methodology against the USAID-approved methodology as reflected in the DQA checklists. The team crosschecked partner and SO PMP indicators against indicators in the USAID/Malawi OP. The team selectively spot-checked the MTTA files for base documents and documentation of the evidence demonstrating achievement of the indicator (e.g., signed per diem receipts to verify attendance at training courses). The team spot-checked operational manuals to confirm the existence of written procedures.
Date(s) of assessment:	November 6, 2007
Assessment team members:	Archanjel Chinkunda, Ramsey Sosola, and Norman L. Olsen
For Office Use Only _____	

CATEGORY	YES	NO	COMMENTS
VALIDITY			
Is there a direct relationship between the program activity and what is being measured? If not, explain connection to the result.	x		The two indicators accurately measure the numbers of students and teachers benefiting from the MTTA program.
Can the result be plausibly attributed to USG assistance?	x		Without USAID assistance, this project would not be taking place. The increase in students able to read at grade level from less than 1% to 9.5% would not have occurred. Neither would the energizing of the educational system in the four districts.
Are the people collecting data qualified and properly supervised?	x		MTTA thoroughly trains the enumerators involved with the project and carefully supervises their work. The enumerators are practicing teachers who are familiar with the schools.
Are steps taken to correct known data errors?	x		MTTA staff review the data as it is collected. Any errors that are detected are then tracked to the source and corrected. All MTTA staff are involved in spot-checking.
Were known data collection problems appropriately assessed?	x		MTTA is well aware of the methodological and logistical difficulties in collecting data from schools that have not generally kept records.
Are steps being taken to limit transcription error?	x		The M&E officer carefully trains data entry personnel and actively supervises their work. He also reviews all final copies for errors.
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?			Data collection issues are clearly discussed in a number of MTTA documents.
RELIABILITY			
Is a consistent data collection process used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source?	x		Data collection procedures have been consistent since the beginning of the project. Techniques for the training of enumerators and spot- checking have been improved by the lessons of experience.
Are there procedures in place for periodic review of data collection, maintenance, and documentation in writing?			MTTA reviews data quarterly. Written procedures are in place.
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?	x		See above
TIMELINESS			
Is a regularized schedule of data collection in place to meet program management needs?	x		MTTA data collection procedures are fully adequate to meet both managerial and reporting requirements. For example, in spot-checking student achievement performance the team was able to track the scores of several students through two complete testing cycles.
Are data properly stored and readily	x		Data are stored on site in hard copies in a data

available?			bank and in a computer. Further backed-up data are stored at the local branch of the National Bank.
PRECISION			
Is there a method for detecting duplicate data?	x		The methodology used for the surveys specifically guards against double-counting. School data are identified by specific child and class, so double-counting is not a major issue.
Is there a method for detecting missing data?	x		Extensive spot-checking rapidly detects most missing data
INTEGRITY			
Are there proper safeguards in place to prevent unauthorized changes to the data?	x		Only MTTA staff have access to the entry and analysis of the raw data.
Is there a need for an independent review of results reported?		x	Project evaluations effectively serve as an independent review.

IF NO RELEVANT DATA WERE AVAILABLE	COMMENTS
If no recent relevant data are available for this indicator, why not?	NA
What concrete actions are now being undertaken to collect and report these data as soon as possible?	
When will data be reported?	

SUMMARY	COMMENTS
Based on the assessment relative to the five standards, what is the overall conclusion regarding the quality of the data?	The data meet USAID standards for both management and reporting.
Significance of limitations (if any):	The Malawian educational system is starting from a very low level in which many schools have only rudimentary equipment and limited understanding of the importance of keeping accurate records of all aspects of school performance.
Actions needed to address limitations (given level of USAID control over data):	Continued USAID staff field visits are important. It would also be useful to bring together, at least semi-annually, the various educational projects to share experiences and identify potential best practices.

USAID/MALAWI DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	INVESTING IN PEOPLE
Area:	12. Education
Element:	3. 2.1 Basic Education
Indicator Title:	Number of learners enrolled in USG-supported primary schools or equivalent non-school- based settings (number of women; number of men) Number of teachers/educators trained with USG support (number of women; number of men) Number of parent-teacher association or similar school governance structures supported
Is this a standard or custom indicator? If standard, make sure the title matches the title in the Indicator Handbooks.	__X_ Standard _____Custom
Data source(s):	_____ Survey/KAP __X__ Implementing partner reports _____ Other (Be specific)
USAID control over data:	_____ High (USAID is source and/or funds data collection) X _Medium (Implementing partner is data source) _____ Low (Data are from a secondary source)
Partner or contractor who provided the data (if applicable):	American Institutes for Research (AIR)
Year or period for which the data are being reported:	October 1, 2006, to September 30, 2007
Data assessment methodology:	The GH Tech team, Archanjel Chinkunda, USAID/Malawi M&E officer, and Florence Nkosi, CTO, visited the Primary School Support Program (PSSP), where the Deputy Chief of Party, Cassandra L. Jessee, and Nick Shawa, M&E Specialist, briefed the team on the program and its performance management practices. The team reviewed the AIR PMP with particular emphasis on the indicators and the evidence used to determine whether they have been achieved. The team assessed the linkage between the AIR and USAID/Malawi PMPs. The team crosschecked the AIR data collection methodology against the USAID-approved methodology as reflected in the DQA checklists. The team crosschecked partner and SO PMP indicators against indicators in the USAID/Malawi Operational Plan. The team selectively spot-checked the partner's files for base documents and documentation of evidence demonstrating achievement of the indicator (e.g., student test scores from various

	schools and years). Specifically, the team traced one school through the initial two years of the project. The team spot-checked operational manuals to confirm the existence of written procedures. A DQA checklist was prepared on the common indicators that PSSP is responsible for reporting on. Using the checklist as the point of departure, the team checked data from the partners for validity, reliability, precision, timeliness, and integrity. Validity was determined by checking for consistent application of the same criteria, formulas, and procedures at all levels of the process. Reliability was checked by determining if the partner used the same data collection methods from year to year. For precision, the primary test used by the GH Tech team was spot-checking the basic questionnaire completed by each school in the program. The team checked timeliness by reviewing quarterly reports to determine the period in which data were reported from field sites to partner and from partner to USAID/Malawi. The team reviewed PSSP procedures to determine if they are adequate to determine integrity.
Date(s) of assessment:	November 8, 2007
Assessment team members:	Archanjel Chinkunda, Florence Nkosi, and Norman L. Olsen
For Office Use Only	

CATEGORY	YES	NO	COMMENTS
VALIDITY			
Is there a direct relationship between the program activity and what is being measured? If not, explain connection to the result.	x		The three indicators for which PSSP is responsible give an accurate picture of the range and quality of activities being used to improve primary education in Dowa District.
Can the result be plausibly attributed to USG assistance?	x		If it were not for USAID support, the activity would not be taking place, nor would the improvements be occurring.
Are the people collecting data qualified and properly supervised?	x		The enrollment data come straight from the schools, the training data from specific courses, and the PTA data from project members. All personnel are qualified to provide the data for which they are responsible. Supervision is adequate, and supported by active field visits from PSSP personnel.
Are steps taken to correct known data errors?	x		PSSP has an active error detection protocol in its software that alerts staff of data that are above or below anticipated norms.

Were known data collection problems appropriately assessed?	x		PSSP is well aware of the difficulties of collecting accurate data on a school system with limited resources and approximately 148,000 primary school children.
Are steps being taken to limit transcription error?	x		There is extensive crosschecking by M&E staff and the Deputy Chief of Party.
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?	x		
RELIABILITY			
Is a consistent data collection process used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source?	x		The processes have been consistent from the beginning of the project.
Are there procedures in place for periodic review of data collection, maintenance, and documentation in writing?	x		Written procedures are in place. The PSSP staff review data at least quarterly.
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?	x		
TIMELINESS			
Is a regularized schedule of data collection in place to meet program management needs?	x		Data collection is fully adequate for management of the PSSP program.
Are data properly stored and readily available?	x		Data are stored on site in the project data bank and off site at the Deputy Chief of Party's residence.
PRECISION			
Is there a method for detecting duplicate data?	x		Children are identified by name and school, which substantially reduces the risk of duplication.
Is there a method for detecting missing data?	x		Extensive crosschecking and close follow-up through field site visits significantly reduce this problem.
INTEGRITY			
Are there proper safeguards in place to prevent unauthorized changes to the data?	x		After transcription, only three project staff members are allowed access to the raw data and analytical processes.
Is there a need for an independent review of results reported?		x	The project is to be evaluated in the next FY, which should serve as an independent review.

IF NO RELEVANT DATA WERE AVAILABLE	COMMENTS
If no recent relevant data are available for this indicator, why not?	NA
What concrete actions are now being undertaken to collect and report these data as soon as possible?	
When will data be reported?	

SUMMARY	COMMENTS
Based on the assessment relative to the five standards, what is the overall conclusion regarding the quality of the data?	The data being collected by PSSP meet USAID standards for management and reporting.
Significance of limitations (if any):	The DOWA school system is hugely under- resourced. The children come from highly disadvantaged backgrounds and consistently score low on the tests PSSP administers. The teachers lack sound professional preparation. All represent significant limitations.
Actions needed to address limitations (given level of USAID control over data):	USAID/Malawi should periodically bring together the staffs of its various educational activities, and perhaps those of other donors, to compare experiences, identify potential best practices, and improve implementation.

USAID/MALAWI DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	INVESTING IN PEOPLE
Area:	12. Education
Element:	12.1 Basic Education
Indicator Title:	12. 1.10 Number of host country institutions with improved management information systems as a result of USG assistance
Is this a standard or custom indicator? If standard, make sure the title matches the title in the Indicator Handbooks.	_X_ Standard _____Custom
Data source(s):	_____ Survey/KAP __x__ Implementing partner reports _____ Other (Be specific)
USAID control over data:	_____ High (USAID is source and/or funds data collection) _X_ Medium (Implementing partner is data source) _____ Low (Data are from a secondary source)
Partner or contractor who provided the data (if applicable):	Academy for Educational Development (AED)
Year or period for which the data are being reported:	October 1, 2006, to September 30, 2007
Data assessment methodology:	The GH Tech team, Archanjel Chinkunda, USAID/Malawi M&E officer, and Ramsey Sosola, CTO, visited the Ministry of Education (MOE) EQUIP2 program. Fahim

USAID/MALAWI DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	INVESTING IN PEOPLE
	Akbar, Education Management and Monitoring Information Systems Advisor, and his team—Chandiwira Nyirenda, Education Planner, Martin Masnche, Senior Education Planner, and Enock Matale, Assistant Statistician—briefed us. The team obtained an overview of the AED program and its performance management practices. The team reviewed the AED PMP with particular emphasis on the indicators and the evidence used to determine whether they have been achieved. The team assessed the linkage between the AED and USAID/Malawi PMPs. The team crosschecked the AED data collection methodology against the USAID-approved methodology as reflected in the DQA checklists. The team crosschecked partner and SO PMP indicators against indicators in the USAID/Malawi OP. The team selectively spot-checked the AED files for base documents and documentation of the evidence demonstrating achievement of the indicator (e.g., signed per diem receipts to verify attendance at training courses). The team spot-checked operational manuals to confirm the existence of written procedures. A DQA checklist was prepared on the common indicators that EQUIP2 is responsible for reporting on. Using the checklist as the point of departure, the team checked data from the partners for validity, reliability, precision, timeliness, and integrity. Validity was determined by checking for consistent application of the same criteria, formulas, and procedures at all levels of the process. Reliability was checked by determining if the partner used the same data collection methods from year to year. The primary test for precision was spot-checking of the basic questionnaire completed by each school in the program. The team checked timeliness by reviewing quarterly reports to determine the period in which data were reported, from field sites to partner, and from partner to USAID/Malawi. The team reviewed EQUIP2 spot-checking procedures to determine if those procedures are adequate to determine integrity.
Date(s) of assessment:	October 30, 2007
Assessment team members:	Barry Silverman, Archanjel Chinkunda, Ramsey Sosola, and Norman L. Olsen
For Office Use Only _____	

CATEGORY	YES	NO	COMMENTS
VALIDITY			
Is there a direct relationship between the program activity and what is being measured? If not, explain connection to the result.	x		The common indicator fits well with the program indicator, assuming that institutions include the approximately 6,300 schools involved in the program. Their management systems have clearly been improved because of the program. So, too, have the information systems of the MOE and the GOM.
Can the result be plausibly attributed to USG assistance?	x		Without USG financial support and a technical advisor, the system would not operate at the level that it now does.
Are the people collecting data qualified and properly supervised?	x		Personnel are trained at three levels (ministry, district, and school) to collect, process, and analyze the data. They are properly supervised at each level. In particular, the EQUIP2 team makes site visits.
Are steps taken to correct known data errors?	x		The basic procedures are effective in reducing error and in detecting and correcting it when it does occur. For purposes of primary education, the MOE divides Malawi into 12 districts and below the districts into 348 zones. Each zone has from 10 to 15 schools, both public and private. Zones with more than 15 schools are occasionally further divided into unofficial zones. The process starts in May/June when the EQUIP2 project, in conjunction with the District Coordinating Primary Education Advisor (PEA), brings together representatives of all the schools in a zone and trains them in how to fill out the national questionnaire. The school representative, normally the headmaster, returns to the school and completes the questionnaire, which is submitted to the PEA, normally in about three weeks. The initial return rate is approximately 85%. It is reviewed by the PEA and district officials and any errors or other issues are sorted out with the school. The PEA signs off on the questionnaire, which is then submitted to EQUIP2. At the national level, the questionnaire is reviewed within EQUIP2 and any errors that are detected are resolved in conversations with the school and the coordinating PEA. EQUIP2 also conducts validation checks, the most important of which is on site visits to the schools for physical verification of the data. Particular attention is paid to attendance, absenteeism, and completion data.
Were known data collection problems appropriately assessed?	x		See directly above
Are steps being taken to limit transcription error?	x		EQUIP2 addresses transcription error by having senior staff spot-check from 10 to 20

			questionnaires a day. The staff immediately corrects any detected errors. EQUIP2 staff state the incident of error is less than 5%.
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?		x	
RELIABILITY			
Is a consistent data collection process used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source?	x		The same processes have been used for the past four years.
Are there procedures in place for periodic review of data collection, maintenance, and documentation in writing?	x		
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?		x	
TIMELINESS			
Is a regularized schedule of data collection in place to meet program management needs?	x		EQUIP2 collects data in June and reports by the end of the calendar year. The EQUIP2 program is the only one in the immediate region that publishes primary and secondary school data in the same year they are collected.
Are data properly stored and readily available?	x		Data are stored with the MOE and available on CD.
PRECISION			
Is there a method for detecting duplicate data?	x		
Is there a method for detecting missing data?	x		Schools that are late in reporting are contacted by both EQUIP2 staff and the coordinating PEA.
INTEGRITY			
Are there proper safeguards in place to prevent unauthorized changes to the data?	x		
Is there a need for an independent review of results reported?		x	

IF NO RELEVANT DATA WERE AVAILABLE	COMMENTS
If no recent relevant data are available for this indicator, why not?	NA
What concrete actions are now being undertaken to collect and report these data as soon as possible?	
When will data be reported?	

SUMMARY	COMMENTS
Based on the assessment relative to the five standards, what is the overall conclusion regarding the quality of the data?	The data meet management standards for the Malawi Ministry of Education.
Significance of limitations (if any):	At the school level, there are significant limitations in resources and skills. Basic record-keeping systems are often deficient. Understanding of statistical data is also limited. The EQUIP2 has some interesting ideas for overcoming these limitations that USAID should encourage; in particular using a geographical rather than a statistical approach to presenting data seems promising.
Actions needed to address limitations (given level of USAID control over data):	During the next data-collection cycle, it is recommended that Mission staff do spot-checks by visits to several of the zone training sessions.

USAID/MALAWI DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	INVESTING IN PEOPLE
Area:	12. Education
Element:	12.1 Basic Education
Indicator Title:	12. 1.14 Number of people trained in strategic information management with USG assistance
Is this a standard or custom indicator? If standard, make sure the title matches the title in the Indicator Handbooks.	_X_ Standard _____Custom
Data source(s):	_____ Survey/KAP X_ Implementing partner reports _____ Other (Be specific)
USAID control over data:	_____ High (USAID is source and/or funds data collection) _X_ Medium (Implementing partner is data source) _____ Low (Data are from a secondary source)
Partner or contractor who provided the data (if applicable):	Academy for Educational Development (AED)
Year or period for which the data are being reported:	October 1, 2006, to September 30, 2007
Data assessment methodology:	The GH Tech team, Archanjel Chinkunda, USAID/Malawi M&E officer, and Ramsey Sosola, CTO, visited the MOE EQUIP2 program. Fahim Akbar Education Management

USAID/MALAWI DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	INVESTING IN PEOPLE
	and Monitoring Information Systems Advisor, and his team—Chandiwira Nyirenda, Education Planner, Martin Masnche, Senior Education Planner, and Enock Matale Assistant Statistician, briefed us. The team obtained an overview of the EQUIP2 program and its performance management practices. The team reviewed the AED PMP with particular emphasis on the indicators and the evidence used to determine whether they have been achieved. The team assessed the linkage between the AED and USAID/Malawi PMPs. The team crosschecked the AED data collection methodology against the USAID-approved methodology as reflected in the DQA checklists. The team crosschecked AED and SO PMP indicators against those in the USAID/Malawi OP. The team selectively spot-checked the AED files for base documents and documentation of the evidence demonstrating achievement of the indicator (e.g., signed per diem receipts to verify attendance at training courses). The team spot-checked operational manuals to confirm the existence of written procedures. A DQA checklist was prepared on the common indicators that EQUIP2 is responsible for reporting on. Using the checklist as the point of departure, the team checked data from AED for validity, reliability, precision, timeliness, and integrity. Validity was determined by checking for consistent application of the same criteria, formulas, and procedures at all levels of the process. Reliability was checked by determining if the partner used the same data collection methods from year to year. The primary test used for precision team was spot-checking of the basic questionnaire completed by each school in the program. The team checked timeliness by reviewing quarterly reports to determine the period in which data were reported from field sites to partner and from partner to USAID/Malawi. The team reviewed EQUIP2 spot-checking procedures to determine if they are adequate to determine integrity.
Date(s) of assessment:	October 30, 2007
Assessment team members:	Barry Silverman, Archanjel Chinkunda, Ramsey Sosola, and Norman L. Olsen
For Office Use Only _____	

CATEGORY	YES	NO	COMMENTS
VALIDITY			
Is there a direct relationship between the program activity and what is being measured? If not, explain connection to the result.	x		Some type of training in strategic information management is provided at the zone and district level.
Can the result be plausibly attributed to USG assistance?	x		
Are the people collecting data qualified and properly supervised?	x		Excellent records are kept on who attended the training sessions.
Are steps taken to correct known data errors?	x		
Were known data collection problems appropriately assessed?	x		
Are steps being taken to limit transcription error?	x		
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?		X	
RELIABILITY			
Is a consistent data collection process used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source?	x		The processes have been consistent for the past four years.
Are there procedures in place for periodic review of data collection, maintenance and documented in writing?	x		Procedures are in place and documented in writing.
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?			
TIMELINESS			
Is a regularized schedule of data collection in place to meet program management needs?	x		Data collection meets program management needs.
Are data properly stored and readily available?	x		Data are stored on CDs and readily available.
PRECISION			
Is there a method for detecting duplicate data?	x		Steps have been taken to avoid double-counting.
Is there a method for detecting missing data?	x		
INTEGRITY			
Are there proper safeguards in place to prevent unauthorized changes to the data?	x		
Is there a need for an independent review of results reported?	x		This is an independent review.

IF NO RELEVANT DATA WERE AVAILABLE	COMMENTS
If no recent relevant data are available for this indicator, why not?	NA
What concrete actions are now being undertaken to collect and report these data as soon as possible?	
When will data be reported?	

SUMMARY	COMMENTS
Based on the assessment relative to the five standards, what is the overall conclusion regarding the quality of the data?	The data are of sufficient quality to meet all management and reporting requirements.
Significance of limitations (if any):	The EQUIP2 program is upgrading the quality of information available to manage education in Malawi. It is being particularly effective in rural areas. There are numerous limitations, most notably the resources available at the school level for basic data collection.
Actions needed to address limitations (given level of USAID control over data):	USAID spot-checking of training would give added impetus to the program.

USAID/MALAWI DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	INVESTING IN PEOPLE
Area:	12. Education
Element:	12.1 Basic Education
Indicator title:	12. 1.11 Number of host country institutions that have used USG-assisted MIS information to inform administrative/management decisions
Is this a standard or custom indicator? If standard, make sure the title matches the title in the Indicator Handbooks.	__X_ Standard _____Custom
Data source(s):	_____ Survey/KAP __X__ Implementing partner reports _____ Other (Be Specific)
USAID control over data:	_____ High (USAID is source and/or funds data collection) __X Medium (Implementing partner is data source) _____ Low (Data are from a secondary source)

USAID/MALAWI DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	INVESTING IN PEOPLE
Partner or contractor who provided the data (if applicable):	Academy for Educational Development (AED)
Year or period for which the data are being reported:	October 1, 2006, to September 30, 2007
Data assessment methodology:	The GH Tech team, Archanjel Chinkunda, USAID/Malawi M&E officer, and Ramsey Sosola, CTO, visited the MOE EQUIP2 program. The team were briefed by Fahim Akbar, Education Management and Monitoring Information Systems Advisor, and his team—Chandiwira Nyirenda, Education Planner, Martin Masnche, Senior Education Planner, and Enock Matale, Assistant Statistician. The team obtained an overview of the EQUIP2 program and its performance management practices. The team reviewed the AED PMP with particular emphasis on the indicators and the evidence used to determine whether they have been achieved. The team assessed the linkage between the AED and USAID/Malawi PMPs. The team crosschecked the AED data collection methodology against the USAID-approved methodology as reflected in the DQA checklists. The team crosschecked partner and SO PMP indicators against those in the USAID/Malawi OP. The team selectively spot-checked the AED files for base documents and documentation of the evidence demonstrating achievement of the indicator (e.g., signed per diem receipts to verify attendance at training courses). The team spot-checked operational manuals to confirm the existence of written procedures. A DQA checklist was prepared on the common indicators that EQUIP2 is responsible for reporting on. Using the checklist as the point of departure, the team checked data from AED for validity, reliability, precision, timeliness, and integrity. Validity was determined by checking for consistent application of the same criteria, formulas, and procedures at all levels of the process. Reliability was checked by determining if AED used the same data collection methods from year to year. The primary test used for precision was spot-checking the basic questionnaire completed by each school in the program. The team checked timeliness by reviewing quarterly reports to determine the period in which data were reported from field sites to partner and from partner to USAID/Malawi. The team reviewed EQUIP2 spot-checking procedures to determine if they are adequate to determine integrity.
Date(s) of assessment:	October 30, 2007
Assessment team members:	Barry Silverman, Archanjel Chinkunda , Ramsey Sosola, and Norman L. Olsen

USAID/MALAWI DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	INVESTING IN PEOPLE
For Office Use Only _____	

CATEGORY	YES	NO	COMMENTS
VALIDITY			
Is there a direct relationship between the program activity and what is being measured? If not, explain connection to the result.	x		All schools, the Ministry of Finance, the Ministry of Education, and approximately 50 civil society organizations used the reports from EQUIP2 to inform their management systems and decision making.
Can the result be plausibly attributed to USG assistance?	x		Without USAID support these improvements would not be occurring.
Are the people collecting data qualified and properly supervised?	x		Personnel are trained at three levels (ministry, district, and school) to collect, process, and analyze the data. They are properly supervised at each level. In particular, the EQUIP2 team makes site visits.
Are steps taken to correct known data errors?	x		
Were known data collection problems appropriately assessed?	x		EQUIP2 is aware that use of the data varies significantly by user.
Are steps being taken to limit transcription error?	x		
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?		X	
RELIABILITY			
Is a consistent data collection process used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source?	x		The process has been consistent for four years.
Are there procedures in place for periodic review of data collection, maintenance, and documentation in writing?	x		Written procedures are in place.
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?		X	
TIMELINESS			
Is a regularized schedule of data collection in place to meet program management needs?	x		Data collection is adequate to meet the needs of managing the current state of the Malawian educational program.

Are data properly stored and readily available?	x		
PRECISION			
Is there a method for detecting duplicate data?	x		
Is there a method for detecting missing data?	x		
INTEGRITY			
Are there proper safeguards in place to prevent unauthorized changes to the data?	x		
Is there a need for an independent review of results reported?			This is an independent review.

IF NO RELEVANT DATA WERE AVAILABLE	COMMENTS
If no recent relevant data are available for this indicator, why not?	NA
What concrete actions are now being undertaken to collect and report these data as soon as possible?	
When will data be reported?	

SUMMARY	COMMENTS
Based on the assessment relative to the five standards, what is the overall conclusion regarding the quality of the data?	The quality of the data meets relevant standards of validity, reliability, precision, timeliness, and integrity for Malawi to manage its educational system.
Significance of limitations (if any):	At the school level, there are significant limitations in resources and in skills. Basic record-keeping systems are often deficient. Understanding of statistical data is also limited.
Actions needed to address limitations (given level of USAID control over data):	

USAID/NAME DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	ECONOMIC GROWTH
Area:	18. Agriculture
Element:	18.2 Agriculture sector productivity
Indicator title:	18. 2.7 Number of rural households benefiting directly from USG assistance 18. 2.8 Number of producer organizations, water users associations, trade and business associations, and CBOs receiving USG assistance 18. 2.9 Number of agriculture-related firms benefiting directly from USG- supported interventions 18. 2.11 Number of individuals who have received USG-supported short- term agricultural sector productivity training (SD)
Is this a standard or custom indicator? If standard, make sure the title matches the title in the Indicator Handbooks.	__X_ Standard _____Custom
Data source(s):	_____ Survey/KAP __X_ Implementing partner reports _____ Other (Be specific)
USAID control over data:	_____ High (USAID is source and/or funds data collection) _X Medium (Implementing partner is data source) _____ Low (Data are from a secondary source)
Partner or contractor who provided the data (if applicable):	Land O' Lakes
Year or period for which the data are being reported:	October 1, 2006, to September 30, 2007
Data assessment methodology:	The GH Tech team and Emmie Kermarga, USAID/Malawi Program Office, visited the Land O'Lakes offices. Gretchen Villegas, Country Manager, and Peter G. Ngoma, M&E Specialist, briefed us. The team reviewed the partner's PMP with particular emphasis on the indicators and the evidence used to determine whether they have been achieved. There has been a chance in implementation modality; sub-partners are now grantees. The team spot-checked the partner's data collection methodology. The team also spot-checked the files for base documents. For example, the team was shown the record books maintained by milk bulking groups (MBGs) and individual dairy farmers. The team was also given the manual used to train farmers in data collection and

USAID/NAME DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	ECONOMIC GROWTH
	reporting. The team spot-checked operational manuals to confirm the existence of written partners, and visited a field site, Chitsanzo Milk Bulking Group, to verify record-keeping processes and supervision.
Date(s) of assessment:	November 5, 2007
Assessment team members:	Barry Silverman and Emmie Kemarga
For Office Use Only _____	

CATEGORY	YES	NO	COMMENTS
VALIDITY			
Is there a direct relationship between the program activity and what is being measured? If not, explain connection to the result.	X		Land O'Lakes is transitioning from direct support of subpartners to grants to subpartners. FY2007 indicator data are being reported as a combination of the two implementation mechanisms.
Can the result be plausibly attributed to USG assistance?	X		These activities would not be possible without USAID support.
Are the people collecting data qualified and properly supervised?	X		Data collectors at all levels are trained and qualified. There is good supervision at all levels.
Are steps taken to correct known data errors?	X		Data are crosschecked at all levels and the risk of error is almost nil.
Were known data collection problems appropriately assessed?	X		Data errors are corrected when found.
Are steps being taken to limit transcription error?	X		Data transcription is spot-checked.
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?	X		Land O'Lakes includes narrative description of data quality issues in its reports.
RELIABILITY			
Is a consistent data collection process used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source?	X		Since the implementation mechanism is transitioning this year, there will be some variation in the source of data. However, the well-established procedures are being applied to the grantees.
Are there procedures in place for periodic review of data collection, maintenance, and documentation in writing?	X		There are well-documented procedures in place,
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?	X		Land O'Lakes includes a narrative description of data quality issues in its reports.

TIMELINESS			
Is a regularized schedule of data collection in place to meet program management needs?	X		Data are collected, analyzed, and reported in a timely fashion.
Are data properly stored and readily available?	X		Land O'Lakes maintains a secure database for the indicator data.
PRECISION			
Is there a method for detecting duplicate data?	X		There is spot-checking of data for duplication, which does not seem to be an issue.
Is there a method for detecting missing data?	X		There is spot-checking of data for missing, which does not seem to be an issue.
INTEGRITY			
Are there proper safeguards in place to prevent unauthorized changes to the data?	X		Only authorized staff have access to the data.
Is there a need for an independent review of results reported?		X	

IF NO RELEVANT DATA WERE AVAILABLE	COMMENTS
If no recent relevant data are available for this indicator, why not?	NA
What concrete actions are now being undertaken to collect and report these data as soon as possible?	
When will data be reported?	

SUMMARY	COMMENTS
Based on the assessment relative to the five standards, what is the overall conclusion regarding the quality of the data?	Land O'Lakes is doing an excellent job of data collection and reporting from the individual farmer to the central level. Data meet the five DQA standards
Significance of limitations (if any):	
Actions needed to address limitations (given level of USAID control over data):	

DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST

USAID/MALAWI DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	ECONOMIC GROWTH
Area:	18. Agriculture
Element:	18.2 Agricultural Sector Productivity
Indicator title:	1. Growth in rural income as a result of USG assistance 2. Number of new technologies or management practices under field testing as a result of USG assistance 3. Number of new technologies or management practices made available for transfer as a result of USG assistance 4. Number of additional hectares under improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance 5. Number of rural households benefiting directly from USG interventions 6. Number of producers organizations, water users associations, trade and business associations, and CBOs assisted as a result of USG interventions (sex-disaggregated) 7. Number of public-private partnerships formed as a result of USG assistance
Is this a standard or custom indicator? If standard, make sure the title matches the title in the Indicator Handbooks.	__X_ Standard _____Custom
Data source(s):	_____ Survey/KAP __X__ Implementing partner reports _____ Other (Be specific)
USAID control over data:	_____ High (USAID is source and/or funds data collection) X _Medium (Implementing partner is data source) _____ Low (Data are from a secondary source)
Partner or contractor who provided the data (if applicable):	Washington State University (WSU)/ Total Landcare (TLC)
Year or period for which the data are being reported:	October 1, 2006, to September 30, 2007
Data assessment methodology:	The GH Tech team, Archanjel Chinkunda, USAID/Malawi M&E officer, and Patricia Ziwa, CTO, visited the WSU program office. Trent Bunderson, Regional Director, and Zwidew Jere, TLC Director,

USAID/MALAWI DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	ECONOMIC GROWTH
	presented an overview on the program. They also outlined WSU performance management practices. The team reviewed the PMP with particular emphasis on the indicators and the evidence used to determine whether they have been achieved. The team assessed the linkage between the WSU and USAID/Malawi PMPs. The team crosschecked the WSU data collection methodology against the USAID-approved methodology as reflected in the DQA checklists. The team crosschecked partner and SO PMP indicators against indicators in the USAID/Malawi OP. The team selectively spot-checked the WSU files for base documents and documentation of the evidence demonstrating achievement of the indicator (e.g., signed per diem receipts to verify attendance at training courses). The team spot-checked operational manuals to confirm the existence of written procedures. A DQA checklist was prepared on the common indicators that WSU is responsible for reporting on. Using the checklist as the point of departure, the team checked data from WSU for validity, reliability, precision, timeliness, and integrity. Validity was determined by checking for consistent application of the same criteria, formulas, and procedures at all levels of the process. Reliability was checked by determining if the partner used the same data collection methods from year to year. . The team checked timeliness by reviewing quarterly reports to determine the period in which data were reported from field sites to partner and from partner to USAID/Malawi. The team reviewed WSU spot-checking procedures to determine if they are adequate to determine integrity.
Date(s) of assessment:	November 1, 2007
Assessment team members:	Archanjel Chinkunda, Patricia Ziwa, Barry Silverman, and Norman L. Olsen
For Office Use Only _____	

CATEGORY	YES	NO	COMMENTS
VALIDITY			
Is there a direct relationship between the program activity and what is being measured? If not, explain connection to the result.	X		The indicators accurately measure the performance of WSU in implementing a multisector program in the Blue Lagoon region of Lake Malawi.
Can the result be plausibly attributed to USG assistance?	X		Without USAID support, the people of the Blue Lagoon region would not be involved with this development program.
Are the people collecting data qualified and properly supervised?	X		The program has two full-time M&E officers. It also has a GIS person to ensure precise measurements. The students at Bundu and Natural Resource Colleges act as enumerators for program surveys. The M&E officers closely supervise them.
Are steps taken to correct known data errors?	X		A minimum of two persons check all data.
Were known data collection problems appropriately assessed?	X		The senior leadership of the program is well aware of the difficulties in data collection for this type of program and has developed excellent procedures/practices to reduce the problems.
Are steps being taken to limit transcription error?	X		Two persons check all data entries.
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?		x	
RELIABILITY			
Is a consistent data collection process used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source?	X		Procedures have been consistent since the beginning of the program. The program is upgrading to access to improve data processing and allow for more sophisticated analysis of the data.
Are there procedures in place for periodic review of data collection, maintenance, and documentation in writing?	X		All aspects of the data collection process from the procedures to the actual data are reviewed annually. Data are reviewed quarterly.
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?		x	
TIMELINESS			
Is a regularized schedule of data collection in place to meet program management needs?	X		Data are reported to USAID/Malawi in quarterly reports.
Are data properly stored and readily available?	X		Data are stored at WSU Lilongwe offices.
PRECISION			
Is there a method for detecting duplicate data?	X		For the most part WSU uses surveys to collect most data, which virtually eliminates double-

			counting. For the household listings, individual households are identified by village. The GIS gives exceptionally accurate location data. In terms of public/private partnerships, the numbers are small enough, and the partnerships specific, that double-counting is not a major issue.
Is there a method for detecting missing data?	X		Any missing data are quickly sought out by the two M&E offices.
INTEGRITY			
Are there proper safeguards in place to prevent unauthorized changes to the data?	X		
Is there a need for an independent review of results reported?		x	

IF NO RELEVANT DATA WERE AVAILABLE	COMMENTS
If no recent relevant data are available for this indicator, why not?	NA
What concrete actions are now being undertaken to collect and report these data as soon as possible?	
When will data be reported?	

SUMMARY	COMMENTS
Based on the assessment relative to the five standards, what is the overall conclusion regarding the quality of the data?	The data meet USAID standards and are sufficient for both management and reporting purposes.
Significance of limitations (if any):	The data are output data and do not measure the impact of the program.
Actions needed to address limitations (given level of USAID control over data):	USAID/Malawi should check the data on periodic field site visits. Staff should also ensure periodic assessment of actual impact.

USAID/MALAWI DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	ECONOMIC GROWTH
Area:	18. Agriculture
Element:	18.2 Agriculture sector productivity
Indicator title:	18. 2.4 Number of new technologies or management practices made available for transfer as a result of USG assistance 18. 2.6 Number of vulnerable households benefiting directly from USG assistance 18. 2.7 Number of rural households benefiting directly from USG assistance 18. 2.8 Number of producer organizations, water users associations, trade and business associations, and CBOs receiving USG assistance 18. 2.11 Number of individuals who have received USG-supported short- term agricultural sector productivity training (SD) 18. 2.11 Number of individuals who have received USG-supported short- term agricultural sector productivity training (SD) 18. 3.1 Number of people benefiting from USG-supported social assistance programming (number of men, women, food insecure, HIV-affected, female-headed households, other targeted vulnerable people) 18. 6.5 Number of people trained in child health care and child nutrition through USG-supported health area programs (SD) 18. 6.5 Number of people trained in child health care and child nutrition through USG-supported health area programs (SD) 18. 6.9 Number of children reached by USG-supported nutrition programs
Is this a standard or custom indicator? If standard, make sure the title matches the title in the Indicator Handbooks.	__X_ Standard _____Custom
Data source(s):	_____ Survey/KAP __X_ Implementing partner reports _____ Other (Be specific)
USAID control over data:	_____ High (USAID is source and/or funds data collection) _X Medium (Implementing partner is data source)

USAID/MALAWI DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	ECONOMIC GROWTH
	____ Low (Data are from a secondary source)
Partner or contractor who provided the data (if applicable):	Catholic Relief Services (CRS)
Year or period for which the data are being reported:	October 1, 2006, to September 30, 2007
Data assessment methodology:	The GH Tech team, Archanjel Chinkunda, USAID/Malawi M&E officer, and Patricia Ziwa, CTO, visited the I-LIFE program offices. The team was briefed by Scott Menzies, Chief of Party; Cristina Hanson, Program Management Unit (PMU); Dr. T.D. Jose, PRU; Fidelis Sinani, PMU; Bena Musembi, PMU; Dziko Chakk, CARE; and Aliza Myers, PMU. The team obtained an overview of the I-LIFE program and its performance management practices. The team reviewed the CRS PMP with particular emphasis on the indicators and the evidence used to determine whether they have been achieved. The team assessed the linkage between the CRS and USAID/Malawi PMPs. The team crosschecked the CRS data collection methodology against the USAID-approved methodology as reflected in the DQA checklists. The team crosschecked partner and SO PMP indicators against those in the USAID/Malawi OP. The team selectively spot-checked the CRS files for base documents and documentation of the evidence demonstrating achievement of the indicator (e.g., subpartner data entry sheets for surveys conducted by I-LIFE). The team spot-checked operational manuals to confirm the existence of written procedures. A DQA checklist was prepared on the indicators that I-LIFE is responsible for reporting on. Using the checklist as the point of departure, the team checked data from the partners for validity, reliability, precision, timeliness, and integrity. Validity was determined by checking for consistent application of the same criteria, formulas, and procedures at all levels of the process. Reliability was checked by determining if the partner used the same data collection methods from year to year. The team checked timeliness by reviewing quarterly reports to determine the period in which data were reported from field sites to partner and from partner to USAID/Malawi. The team reviewed spot-checking procedures to determine if those procedures are adequate to determine integrity.
Date(s) of Assessment:	November 2, 2007
Assessment Team Members:	Archanjel Chinkunda, Patricia Ziwa, and Norman L. Olsen

USAID/MALAWI DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	ECONOMIC GROWTH
For Office Use Only	

CATEGORY	YES	NO	COMMENTS
VALIDITY			
Is there a direct relationship between the program activity and what is being measured? If not, explain connection to the result.	x		The I-LIFE program consists of three elements: 1) agriculture sector productivity, 2) maternal and child health (MCH), and 3) social assistance. Seven NGO partners working as the I-LIFE consortium implement the program. Each implements all three elements using all nine indicators to measure progress. Each follows the same core procedures in obtaining performance data.
Can the result be plausibly attributed to USG assistance?	x		Without USAID support, none of these interventions would be taking place.
Are the people collecting data qualified and properly supervised?	x		Each of the seven NGOs has an M&E officer responsible for supervising data collection. All seven are stationed in the operational area.
Are steps taken to correct known data errors?	x		Data originate at the community level and are passed monthly to the NGO M&E officer, where they are reviewed and potential errors are resolved. The NGOs prepare quarterly reports for I-LIFE headquarters, where the data are again reviewed and errors resolved. Members of the I-LIFE PMU make monthly site visits to each of the seven operational areas.
Were known data collection problems appropriately assessed?	x		In a consortium of this type with varying organizational cultures and a multisector intervention approach involving rural Africa, there are significant data collection problems. The M&E officers meet once a month to discuss issues and resolve problems.
Are steps being taken to limit transcription error?	x		Transcription errors exist at each level but seem to be within approximately a 5% margin of error, which is acceptable for this program and environment.
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?		x	Data quality problems are freely discussed with the CTO but generally not discussed in quarterly and annual reports

RELIABILITY			
Is a consistent data collection process used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source?	x		The basic processes have been consistent since the beginning of the activity. However, the consortium has consistently attempted to improve its processes, so some changes have occurred. For example, to avoid double- counting errors I-LIFE is working to provide separate ID numbers to households and individuals.
Are there procedures in place for periodic review of data collection, maintenance and documented in writing?	x		Written procedures are in place. M&E officers meet monthly to review data, indicators, and progress.
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?		x	See above
TIMELINESS			
Is a regularized schedule of data collection in place to meet program management needs?	x		Monthly reports are received from the participating communities, and quarterly reports from each of the seven NGOs. I-LIFE staff make at least monthly field visits to operational sites. This clearly meets management needs.
Are data properly stored and readily available?	x		Data are stored by the participating communities, the seven NGOs, and I-LIFE HQ.
PRECISION			
Is there a method for detecting duplicate data?	x		I-LIFE actively searches out double- counting but is aware that in a program of this size and character, some is inevitable. Establishing both household and individual ID numbers is an attempt to reduce the problem.
Is there a method for detecting missing data?	x		Data are reviewed at each level and any missing elements detected. I-LIFE makes an aggressive effort to fill in any blanks.
INTEGRITY			
Are there proper safeguards in place to prevent unauthorized changes to the data?	x		The M&E officers are responsible for preparing reports and making any changes in the data.
Is there a need for an independent review of results reported?		x	

IF NO RELEVANT DATA WERE AVAILABLE	COMMENTS
If no recent relevant data are available for this indicator, why not?	NA
What concrete actions are now being undertaken to collect and report these data as soon as possible?	
When will data be reported?	

SUMMARY	COMMENTS
Based on the assessment relative to the five standards, what is the overall conclusion regarding the quality of the data?	The data are of excellent quality and meet USAID standards for both program management and reporting.
Significance of limitations (if any):	The output indicators do not always tell the complete story of actual impact.
Actions needed to address limitations (given level of USAID control over data):	Continued management involvement with more field visits to operational sites is recommended. A dialogue on development of impact indicators would be useful.

USAID/MALAWI DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	ECONOMIC GROWTH
Area:	20. Economic Opportunity
Element:	20.1 Inclusive financial markets
Indicator title:	20. 1.1 Number of clients at USG-assisted microfinance institutions (SD)
Is this a standard or custom indicator? If standard, make sure the title matches the title in the Indicator Handbooks.	__X_ Standard _____Custom
Data source(s):	_____ Survey/KAP __X_ Implementing partner reports _____ Other (Be Specific)
USAID control over data:	_____ High (USAID is source and/or funds data collection) _X Medium (Implementing partner is data source) _____ Low (Data are from a secondary source)
Partner or contractor who provided the data (if applicable):	Chemonics International
Year or period for which the data are being reported:	October 1, 2006, to September 30, 2007
Data assessment methodology:	The GH Tech team and Archanjel Chinkunda, USAID/Malawi M&E officer, visited the Chemonics International microfinance project. Victor Luboyeski, Chief of Party, briefed us on the project and its performance management practices. The team reviewed the Chemonics PMP with particular emphasis on the indicators and the evidence used to determine whether they have been achieved. The team assessed the linkage between the partner's and USAID/Malawi's PMPs. The

USAID/MALAWI DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	ECONOMIC GROWTH
	team crosschecked the partner's data collection methodology against the USAID- approved methodology as reflected in the DQA checklists. The team crosschecked partner and SO PMP indicators against those in the USAID/Malawi OP. The team selectively spot-checked the partner's files for base documents and documentation of the evidence demonstrating achievement of the indicator (e.g., signed per diem receipts to verify attendance at training courses). The team spot-checked operational manuals to confirm the existence of written procedures. A DQA checklist was prepared on the common indicators that Chemonics is responsible for reporting on. Using the checklist as the point of departure, the team checked data from Chemonics for validity, reliability, precision, timeliness, and integrity. Validity was determined by checking for consistent application of the same criteria, formulas, and procedures at all levels of the process. Reliability was checked by determining if the partner used the same data collection methods from year to year. The team checked timeliness by reviewing quarterly reports to determine the period in which data were reported from field sites to partner and from partner to USAID/Malawi. The team reviewed the Chemonics spot-checking procedures to determine if they are adequate to determine integrity.
Date(s) of assessment:	November 1,2007
Assessment team members:	Barry Silverman, Archanjel Chinkunda, and Norman L. Olsen
For Office Use Only	

CATEGORY	YES	NO	COMMENTS
VALIDITY			
Is there a direct relationship between the program activity and what is being measured? If not, explain connection to the result.	X		The project directly assists microfinance institutions.
Can the result be plausibly attributed to USG assistance?	X		Without USAID-funded assistance, the policy environment for microfinance would not have been positively changed.
Are the people collecting data qualified and properly supervised?	X		Supervision and training of employees of both Chemonics and their partner microfinance institutions meet commercial banking standards.
Are steps taken to correct known data errors?	X		Both the M&E specialist and the COP for Chemonics actively review the quarterly data received from partners. Data that do not fit the trend lines or seem out of line with previous data for the same indicator are reviewed with the partner and changed if necessary.
Were known data collection problems appropriately assessed?	X		The single largest data collection problem is correctly accounting for the number of persons in a group receiving a loan. Chemonics has in place procedures to sort through this issue.
Are steps being taken to limit transcription error?	X		Partners submit to Chemonics a quarterly electronic report that virtually eliminates transcription error at that level. The problem is potentially more serious at the lending level, but crosschecking of data from quarter to quarter reduces the risk.
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?	X		Data issues were identified in the last annual report.
RELIABILITY			
Is a consistent data collection process used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source?	X		Procedures have been consistent since the inception of the project in 2004.
Are there procedures in place for periodic review of data collection, maintenance, and documentation in writing?	x		Written procedures are in place.
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?	X		Data issues were identified in the last annual report.
TIMELINESS			
Is a regularized schedule of data collection in place to meet program management needs?	X		Chemonics partners record the data as the events occur. They report the data to Chemonics quarterly. Chemonics reports to USAID/Malawi quarterly.
Are data properly stored and readily available?	X		Data are stored at Chemonics and at their partners' locations.

PRECISION			
Is there a method for detecting duplicate data?	X		The quarterly review process specifically looks for duplicate data.
Is there a method for detecting missing data?	X		In its quarterly review process, Chemonics quickly identifies institutions that do not report on time or have missing data. Follow-up to seek out any missing data is immediate. There is a financial incentive to report data on time and accurately in that any financial support to the reporting institution is delayed until the data are supplied.
INTEGRITY			
Are there proper safeguards in place to prevent unauthorized changes to the data?	X		
Is there a need for an independent review of results reported?		x	

IF NO RELEVANT DATA WERE AVAILABLE	COMMENTS
If no recent relevant data are available for this indicator, why not?	NA
What concrete actions are now being undertaken to collect and report these data as soon as possible?	
When will data be reported?	

SUMMARY	COMMENTS
Based on the assessment relative to the five standards, what is the overall conclusion regarding the quality of the data?	The quality of the data meets USAID standards. Data are fully adequate for both management and reporting purposes.
Significance of limitations (if any):	Microfinance involves hundreds of thousands of accounts in an environment generally unfamiliar with basic banking procedures. Errors are likely, if not inevitable. Chemonics has in place systems that seem likely to minimize any limitations.
Actions needed to address limitations (given level of USAID control over data):	Continued active management and monitoring by USAID/Malawi staff are recommended.

USAID/MALAWI DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	ECONOMIC GROWTH
Area:	20. Economic Opportunity
Element:	20.1 Inclusive financial markets
Indicator title:	20. 1.2 Total savings deposits held by USG-assisted microfinance institutions

USAID/MALAWI DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	ECONOMIC GROWTH
Is this a standard or custom Indicator? If standard, make sure the title matches the title in the Indicator Handbooks.	__X_ Standard ____Custom
Data source(s):	____ Survey/KAP __X_ Implementing partner reports ____ Other (Be specific)
USAID control over data:	____ High (USAID is source and/or funds data collection) _X Medium (Implementing partner is data source) ____ Low (Data are from a secondary source)
Partner or contractor who provided the data (if applicable):	Chemonics International
Year or period for which the data are being reported:	October 1, 2006, to September 30, 2007
Data assessment methodology:	The GH Tech team and Archanjel Chinkunda, USAID/Malawi M&E officer, visited the Chemonics microfinance project. Victor Luboyeski, Chief of Party, briefed us on the project and its performance management practices. The team reviewed the Chemonics PMP with particular emphasis on the indicators and the evidence used to determine whether they had been achieved. The team assessed the linkage between the Chemonics and the USAID/Malawi PMPs. The team crosschecked the partner's data collection methodology against the USAID-approved methodology as reflected in the DQA checklists. The team crosschecked partner and SO PMP indicators against those in the USAID/Malawi OP. The team selectively spot-checked the partner's files for base documents and documentation of the evidence demonstrating achievement of the indicator (e.g., signed per diem receipts to verify attendance at training courses). The team spot-checked operational manuals to confirm the existence of written procedures. A DQA checklist was prepared on the indicators that Chemonics is responsible for reporting on. Using the checklist as the point of departure, the team checked data from the partners for validity, reliability, precision, timeliness, and integrity. Validity was determined by checking for consistent application of the same criteria, formulas, and procedures at all levels of the process. Reliability was checked by determining if the partner used

USAID/MALAWI DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	ECONOMIC GROWTH
	the same data collection methods from year to year. The primary test used by the GH Tech team was spot-checking of the basic questionnaire completed by each school in the program. The team checked timeliness by reviewing quarterly reports to determine the period in which data were reported from field sites to partner and from partner to USAID/Malawi. The team reviewed Chemonics spot-checking procedures to determine if they are adequate to determine integrity.
Date(s) of assessment:	November 1, 2007
Assessment team members:	Barry Silverman, Archanjel Chinkunda, and Norman L. Olsen
For Office Use Only _____	

CATEGORY	YES	NO	COMMENTS
VALIDITY			
Is there a direct relationship between the program activity and what is being measured? If not, explain connection to the result.	x		Without USAID assistance, microfinance savings deposits in Malawi would not have increased.
Can the result be plausibly attributed to USG assistance?	x		USAID/Malawi-assisted institutions progressed faster than other microfinance institutions.
Are the people collecting data qualified and properly supervised?	x		Supervision and training of employees of both Chemonics and its partner institutions meet commercial banking standards.
Are steps taken to correct known data errors?	x		Both the M&E specialist and the COP actively review quarterly data received from partners. Data that do not fit the trend lines or seem out of line with previous data for the same indicator are reviewed with the partner and changed if necessary.
Were known data collection problems appropriately assessed?	x		Normal commercial banking processes are used by the partner institutions in daily recording of savings deposit information.
Are steps being taken to limit transcription error?	x		Partners submit to Chemonics a quarterly electronic report that virtually eliminates transcription error at that level. The problem is potentially more serious at the lending level, but crosschecking of data from quarter to quarter reduces the risk.

Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?	x		Potential data issues were identified in the last annual report.
RELIABILITY			
Is a consistent data collection process used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source?	x		Procedures have been consistent since the inception of the project in 2004.
Are there procedures in place for periodic review of data collection, maintenance, and documentation in writing?	x		Written procedures are in place.
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?	x		Data issues were discussed in the last annual report.
TIMELINESS			
Is a regularized schedule of data collection in place to meet program management needs?	x		Chemonics partners record deposit data on the day of deposit. They report the data to Chemonics quarterly. Chemonics reports to USAID/Malawi quarterly.
Are data properly stored and readily available?	x		Data are stored at Chemonics and at their partner locations.
PRECISION			
Is there a method for detecting duplicate data?	x		
Is there a method for detecting missing data?	x		In its quarterly review process, Chemonics quickly identifies institutions that do not report on time or have missing data. Follow- up to seek out any missing data is immediate. There is a financial incentive to report data on time and accurately in that any financial support to the institution is delayed until the data are supplied.
INTEGRITY			
Are there proper safeguards in place to prevent unauthorized changes to the data?	x		
Is there a need for an independent review of results reported?		x	

IF NO RELEVANT DATA WERE AVAILABLE	COMMENTS
If no recent relevant data are available for this indicator, why not?	NA
What concrete actions are now being undertaken to collect and report these data as soon as possible?	
When will data be reported?	

SUMMARY	COMMENTS
Based on the assessment relative to the five standards, what is the overall conclusion regarding the quality of the data?	The quality of the data meets USAID standards. Data are fully adequate for both management and reporting purposes
Significance of limitations (if any):	Microfinance involves hundreds of thousands of accounts in an environment generally unfamiliar with basic banking procedures. Errors are likely if not inevitable. Chemonics has in place systems that seem likely to minimize any limitations.
Actions needed to address limitations (given level of USAID control over data):	Continued active management and monitoring by USAID/Malawi staff are recommended.

DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST

USAID/MALAWI DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	ECONOMIC GROWTH
Area:	20. Economic Opportunity
Element:	20.1 Inclusive financial markets
Indicator title:	20. 1.4 Number of microfinance Institutions supported by USG financial or technical assistance
Is this a standard or custom Indicator? If standard, make sure the title matches the title in the Indicator Handbooks.	__X_ Standard _____Custom
Data source(s):	_____ Survey/KAP __X_ Implementing partner reports _____ Other (Be specific)
USAID control over data:	_____ High (USAID is source and/or funds data collection) _X Medium (Implementing partner is data source) _____ Low (Data are from a secondary source)
Partner or contractor who provided the data (if applicable):	Chemonics International
Year or period for which the data are being reported:	October 1, 2006, to September 30, 2007
Data assessment methodology:	The GH Tech team and Archanjel Chinkunda, USAID/Malawi M&E officer, visited the Chemonics microfinance project. Victor Luboyeski, Chief of Party, briefed us on the project and its performance management practices. The team reviewed the Chemonics PMP with particular emphasis on the

USAID/MALAWI DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	ECONOMIC GROWTH
	indicators and the evidence used to determine whether they have been achieved. The team assessed the linkage between the Chemonics and USAID/Malawi PMPs. The team crosschecked the partner's data collection methodology against the USAID-approved methodology as reflected in the DQA checklists. The team crosschecked partner and SO PMP indicators against those in the USAID/Malawi OP. The team selectively spot-checked the partner's files for base documents and documentation of the evidence demonstrating achievement of the indicator (e.g., signed per diem receipts to verify attendance at training courses). The team spot-checked operational manuals to confirm the existence of written procedures. A DQA checklist was prepared on the common indicators that Chemonics is responsible for reporting on. Using the checklist as the point of departure, the team checked data from the partners for validity, reliability, precision, timeliness, and integrity. Validity was determined by checking for consistent application of the same criteria, formulas, and procedures at all levels of the process. Reliability was checked by determining if the partner used the same data collection methods from year to year. The team checked timeliness by reviewing quarterly reports to determine the period in which data were reported, from field sites to partner, and from partner to USAID/Malawi. The team reviewed Chemonics spot-checking procedures to determine if they are adequate to determine integrity.
Date(s) of Assessment:	November 1, 2007
Assessment Team Members:	Barry Silverman, Archanjel Chinkunda, and Norman L. Olsen
For Office Use Only	

CATEGORY	YES	NO	COMMENTS
VALIDITY			
Is there a direct relationship between the program activity and what is being measured? If not explain connection to the result.	x		This activity provides technical assistance to selected Malawian microfinance institutions.
Can the result be plausibly attributed to USG assistance?	x		Without USAID assistance, these institutions would not be receiving technical assistance.
Are the people collecting data qualified and properly supervised?	x		
Are steps taken to correct known data errors?	x		
Were known data collection problems appropriately assessed?	x		
Are steps being taken to limit transcription error?	x		
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?	x		Data issues were discussed in the last annual report
RELIABILITY			
Is a consistent data collection process used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source?	x		Procedures have been consistent since the 2004 start of the project.
Are there procedures in place for periodic review of data collection, maintenance, and documentation in writing?	x		Written procedures are in place.
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?	x		Data issues were discussed in the last annual report.
TIMELINESS			
Is a regularized schedule of data collection in place to meet program management needs?	x		
Are data properly stored and readily available?	x		Data are stored at Chemonics.
PRECISION			
Is there a method for detecting duplicate data?	x		The quarterly review process specifically looks for duplicate data.
Is there a method for detecting missing data?	x		In its quarterly review process, Chemonics quickly identifies institutions that do not report on time or have missing data. Follow- up to seek out any missing data is immediate. There is a financial incentive to report data on time and accurately in that any financial support to the institution is delayed until the data are supplied.

INTEGRITY			
Are there proper safeguards in place to prevent unauthorized changes to the data?	x		
Is there a need for an independent review of results reported?		x	

IF NO RELEVANT DATA WERE AVAILABLE	COMMENTS
If no recent relevant data are available for this indicator, why not?	NA
What concrete actions are now being undertaken to collect and report these data as soon as possible?	
When will data be reported?	

SUMMARY	COMMENTS
Based on the assessment relative to the five standards, what is the overall conclusion regarding the quality of the data?	The data meet USAID standards.
Significance of limitations (if any):	None
Actions needed to address limitations (given level of USAID control over data):	

USAID/MALAWI DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	ECONOMIC GROWTH
Area:	20. Economic Opportunity
Element:	20.1 Inclusive financial markets
Indicator title:	20. 1.5 Percent of USG-assisted microfinance institutions that have reached operational sustainability
Is this a standard or custom indicator? If standard, make sure the title matches the title in the Indicator Handbooks.	__X_ Standard _____Custom
Data source(s):	_____ Survey/KAP __X_ Implementing partner reports _____ Other (Be specific)
USAID control over data:	_____ High (USAID is source and/or funds data collection) _X Medium (Implementing partner is data source)

USAID/MALAWI DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	ECONOMIC GROWTH
	____ Low (Data are from a secondary source)
Partner or contractor who provided the data (if applicable):	Chemonics International
Year or period for which the data are being reported:	October 1, 2006, to September 30, 2007
Data assessment methodology:	The GH Tech team and Archanjel Chinkunda, USAID/Malawi M&E officer, visited the Chemonics microfinance project. Victor Luboyeski, Chief of Party, briefed us on the project and its performance management practices. The team reviewed the Chemonics PMP with particular emphasis on the indicators and the evidence used to determine whether they have been achieved. The team assessed the linkage between the partner's and USAID/Malawi's PMPs. The team crosschecked the partner's data collection methodology against the USAID-approved methodology as reflected in the DQA checklists. The team crosschecked partner and SO PMP indicators against those in the USAID/Malawi Operational Plan. The team selectively spot-checked the partner's files for base documents and documentation of the evidence demonstrating achievement of the indicator (e.g., signed per diem receipts to verify attendance at training courses). The team spot-checked operational manuals to confirm the existence of written procedures. A DQA checklist was prepared on the indicators that Chemonics is responsible for reporting on. Using the checklist as the point of departure, the team checked data from the partners for validity, reliability, precision, timeliness, and integrity. Validity was determined by checking for consistent application of the same criteria, formulas, and procedures at all levels of the process. Reliability was checked by determining if the partner used the same data collection methods from year to year. The team checked timeliness by reviewing quarterly reports to determine the period in which data were reported from field sites to partner and from partner to USAID/Malawi. The team reviewed Chemonics spot-checking procedures to determine if they are adequate to determine integrity.
Date(s) of assessment:	November 1, 2007
Assessment team members:	Barry Silverman, Archanjel Chinkunda, and Norman L. Olsen

USAID/MALAWI DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	ECONOMIC GROWTH
For Office Use Only _____	

CATEGORY	YES	NO	COMMENTS
VALIDITY			
Is there a direct relationship between the program activity and what is being measured? If not, explain connection to the result.	x		Operational stability is defined as internal revenue meets operational costs. This indicator measures its attainment.
Can the result be plausibly attributed to USG assistance?	x		Without USAID assistance, these institutions would not achieve operational sustainability.
Are the people collecting data qualified and properly supervised?	x		Supervision and training of employees of both Chemonics and their partner microfinance institutions meet commercial banking standards.
Are steps taken to correct known data errors?	x		Both the M&E specialist and the COP actively review the quarterly data received from partners. Data that do not fit the trend lines or seem out of line with previous data for the same indicator are reviewed with the partner and changed if necessary.
Were known data collection problems appropriately assessed?	x		Normal commercial banking processes are used by the partner institutions to record a range of operational information.
Are steps being taken to limit transcription error?	x		Partners submit to Chemonics a quarterly electronic report that virtually eliminates transcription error at that level. The problem is potentially more serious at the lending level, but crosschecking of data from quarter to quarter reduces the risk.
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?	x		Data issues were discussed in the last annual report.
RELIABILITY			
Is a consistent data collection process used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source?	x		Procedures have been consistent since the start of the project in 2004.
Are there procedures in place for periodic review of data collection, maintenance, and documentation in writing?	x		Written procedures are in place.
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?	x		Data issues were discussed in the last annual report.

TIMELINESS			
Is a regularized schedule of data collection in place to meet program management needs?	x		Chemonics partners record the data as the events occur. They report the data to Chemonics quarterly. Chemonics reports to USAID/Malawi quarterly.
Are data properly stored and readily available?	x		Data are stored by Chemonics and their partners.
PRECISION			
Is there a method for detecting duplicate data?	x		The quarterly review process specifically looks for duplicate data.
Is there a method for detecting missing data?	x		In its quarterly review process, Chemonics quickly identifies institutions that do not report on time or have missing data. Follow- up to seek out any missing data is immediate. There is a financial incentive to report data on time and accurately in that any financial support to the institution is delayed until the data are supplied.
INTEGRITY			
Are there proper safeguards in place to prevent unauthorized changes to the data?	x		
Is there a need for an independent review of results reported?		x	

IF NO RELEVANT DATA WERE AVAILABLE	COMMENTS
If no recent relevant data are available for this indicator, why not?	NA
What concrete actions are now being undertaken to collect and report these data as soon as possible?	
When will data be reported?	

SUMMARY	COMMENTS
Based on the assessment relative to the five standards, what is the overall conclusion regarding the quality of the data?	The data meet USAID standards.
Significance of limitations (if any):	The limitations are that microfinance institutions are relatively new to Malawi, revenue sources are limited, and there are significant costs. Errors in accounting are likely, if not inevitable. Chemonics has in place systems that seem likely to minimize these limitations.
Actions needed to address limitations (given level of USAID control over data):	Continued active management and monitoring by USAID/Malawi staff are recommended.

USAID/MALAWI DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	ECONOMIC GROWTH
Area:	23. Disaster Readiness
Element:	23.1 Capacity building, preparedness and planning
Indicator title:	23. 1.2 Number of countries with early warning systems linked to a response system in place as a result of USG assistance (bureau reported)
Is this a standard or custom indicator? If standard, make sure the title matches the title in the Indicator Handbooks.	__X_ Standard _____Custom
Data source(s):	_____ Survey/KAP __X_ Implementing partner reports _____ Other (Be specific)
USAID control over data:	_____ High (USAID is source and/or funds data collection) _X Medium (Implementing partner is data source) _____ Low (Data are from a secondary source)
Partner or contractor who provided the data (if applicable):	Chemonics International
Year or period for which the data are being reported:	October 1, 2006, to September 30, 2007
Data assessment methodology:	The GH Tech team, Archanjel Chinkunda, USAID/Malawi M&E officer, and Patricia Ziwa, CTO visited the Famine Early Warning Systems Network (FEWSNET) program. The team was briefed by Sam Chimwaza, Country FEWSNET Representative Malawi, and Evance Chapasuka, Deputy Country FEWSNET representative Malawi. The team obtained an overview of the FEWSNET program and its performance management practices. The team reviewed the FEWSNET PMP with particular emphasis on the indicators and the evidence used to determine whether they have been achieved. The team assessed the linkage between the partner's and USAID/Malawi's PMPs. The team crosschecked the partner's data collection methodology against the USAID-approved methodology as reflected in the DQA checklists. The team crosschecked partner and SO PMP indicators against those in the USAID/Malawi Operational Plan. The team selectively spot-checked the partner's files for base documents and documentation of the evidence demonstrating achievement of the indicator (e.g., signed per diem receipts to verify attendance at training

USAID/MALAWI DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	ECONOMIC GROWTH
	courses). The team spot-checked operational manuals to confirm the existence of written procedures. A DQA checklist was prepared on the indicators that FEWSNET is responsible for reporting on. Using the checklist as the point of departure, the team checked data from the partners for validity, reliability, precision, timeliness, and integrity. Validity was determined by checking for consistent application of the same criteria, formulas, and procedures at all levels of the process. Reliability was checked by determining if the partner used the same data collection methods from year to year. The team checked timeliness by reviewing quarterly reports to determine the period in which data were reported from field sites to partner and from partner to USAID/Malawi. The team reviewed FEWSNET spot-checking procedures to determine if they are adequate to determine integrity.
Date(s) of assessment:	October 31, 2007
Assessment team members:	Barry Silverman, Archanjel Chinkunda, Patricia Ziwa, and Norman L. Olsen
For Office Use Only _____	

CATEGORY	YES	NO	COMMENTS
VALIDITY			
Is there a direct relationship between the program activity and what is being measured? If not, explain connection to the result.	x		Without USAID support, there would not be a FEWSNET Malawi.
Can the result be plausibly attributed to USG assistance?	x		The early warnings provided by the FEWSNET system of looming food security problems are a direct result of USAID support.
Are the people collecting data qualified and properly supervised?	x		The two senior FEWSNET persons are highly qualified; both have advanced technical degrees and manage the project effectively.
Are steps taken to correct known data errors?	x		On-site field checks are made of any data anomalies. The FEWSNET team promptly corrects any detected errors. On-site checks consume approximately 20% of FEWSNET team time.
Were known data collection problems appropriately assessed?	x		The FEWSNET team does an excellent job of analyzing the data, verifying the remote sensing elements, and correcting any anomalies.

Are steps being taken to limit transcription error?	x		
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?		x	FEWSNET does not believe it has any major data quality problems.
RELIABILITY			
Is a consistent data collection process used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source?	x		The same general processes have been used for the past six years.
Are there procedures in place for periodic review of data collection, maintenance and documented in writing?	x		Written procedures are in place.
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?		x	
TIMELINESS			
Is a regularized schedule of data collection in place to meet program management needs?	x		The data collection process meets the needs of informing all relevant Malawian authorities of potential food security problems.
Are data properly stored and readily available?	x		Data are stored on site in Excel spreadsheets and in Chemonics US headquarters.
PRECISION			
Is there a method for detecting duplicate data?	x		Duplicate data are not an issue in this activity
Is there a method for detecting missing data?	x		The FEWSNET team constantly monitors data acquisition activities and searches out any missing data.
INTEGRITY			
Are there proper safeguards in place to prevent unauthorized changes to the data?	x		
Is there a need for an independent review of results reported?		x	The ultimate test of the accuracy of the FEWSNET data is that actual events confirm their projections. So far, they have an excellent record.

IF NO RELEVANT DATA WERE AVAILABLE	COMMENTS
If no recent relevant data are available for this indicator, why not?	NA
What concrete actions are now being undertaken to collect and report these data as soon as possible?	
When will data be reported?	

SUMMARY	COMMENTS
Based on the assessment relative to the five standards, what is the overall conclusion regarding the quality of the data?	The overall quality of the data is as excellent as the component parts allow. The data clearly meet the need to provide early warning of potential food security problems in Malawi.
Significance of limitations (if any):	Remote sensing is subject to limitations of ground-truthing; meteorological projections are subject to significant error.
Actions needed to address limitations (given level of USAID control over data):	No action is necessary at this time.

USAID/MALAWI DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	ECONOMIC GROWTH
Area:	23. Disaster Readiness
Element:	23.1 Capacity building, preparedness, and planning
Indicator Title:	23. 1.3 Number of people trained in disaster preparedness (sd)
Is this a standard or custom Indicator? If standard, make sure the title matches the title in the Indicator Handbooks.	__X_ Standard _____Custom
Data source(s):	_____ Survey/KAP __X_ Implementing partner reports _____ Other (Be specific)
USAID control over data:	_____ High (USAID is source and/or funds data collection) _X Medium (Implementing partner is data source) _____ Low (Data are from a secondary source)
Partner or contractor who provided the data (if applicable):	Chemonics International
Year or period for which the data are being reported:	October 1, 2006, to September 30, 2007
Data assessment methodology:	The GH Tech team, Archanjel Chinkunda, USAID/Malawi M&E officer, and Patricia Ziwa, CTO, visited the Famine Early Warning Systems Network (FEWSNET) program. The team was briefed by Sam Chimwaza, Country FEWSNET Representative Malawi, and Evance Chapasuka Deputy Country FEWSNET Representative Malawi. The team obtained an overview of the FEWSNET program and its performance management practices. The team reviewed the FEWSNET PMP with particular emphasis on

USAID/MALAWI DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	ECONOMIC GROWTH
	the indicators and the evidence used to determine whether they have been achieved. The team assessed the linkage between the partner's and USAID/Malawi's PMPs. The team crosschecked the partner's data collection methodology against the USAID-approved methodology as reflected in the DQA checklists. The team crosschecked partner and SO PMP indicators against those in the USAID/Malawi OP. The team selectively spot-checked the partner's files for base documents and documentation of the evidence demonstrating achievement of the indicator (e.g., signed per diem receipts to verify attendance at training courses). The team spot-checked operational manuals to confirm the existence of written procedures. A DQA checklist was prepared on the indicators that FEWSNET is responsible for reporting on. Using the checklist as the point of departure, the team checked data from the partners for validity, reliability, precision, timeliness, and integrity. Validity was determined by checking for consistent application of the same criteria, formulas, and procedures at all levels of the process. Reliability was checked by determining if the partner used the same data collection methods from year to year. The team checked timeliness by reviewing quarterly reports to determine the period in which data were reported from field sites to partner and from partner to USAID/Malawi. The team reviewed FEWSNET spot-checking procedures to determine if they are adequate to determine integrity.
Date(s) of assessment:	October 31, 2007
Assessment team members:	Barry Silverman, Archanjel Chinkunda, Patricia Ziwa, and Norman L. Olsen

CATEGORY	YES	NO	COMMENTS
VALIDITY			
Is there a direct relationship between the program activity and what is being measured? If not explain connection to the result.	x		Training is an essential element in capacity building.
Can the result be plausibly attributed to USG assistance?	x		Without USAID support, neither the activity nor the training would exist.
Are the people collecting data qualified and properly supervised?	x		After training, the field assessment personnel are closely supervised by FEWSNET personnel and subject to random site visits.
Are steps taken to correct known data errors?	x		On-site field checks are made of any data anomalies. The FEWSNET team promptly corrects any detected errors. On-site checks consume approximately 20% of FEWSNET team time.
Were known data collection problems appropriately assessed?	x		
Are steps being taken to limit transcription error?	x		FEWSNET does not believe this is a major issue in this activity
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?		x	
RELIABILITY			
Is a consistent data collection process used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source?	x		FEWSNET has followed similar processes for several years.
Are there procedures in place for periodic review of data collection, maintenance, and documentation in writing?	x		Written procedures are in place.
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?		x	
TIMELINESS			
Is a regularized schedule of data collection in place to meet program management needs?	x		The data collection process follows the cropping cycle.
Are data properly stored and readily available?	x		Data are stored on site and at Chemonics HQ in Washington
PRECISION			
Is there a method for detecting duplicate data?	x		Essentially this is not an issue for the FEWSNET activity
Is there a method for detecting missing data?	x		FEWSNET closely monitors the data collection processes and searches out missing data.
INTEGRITY			
Are there proper safeguards in place to prevent unauthorized changes to the data?	x		Only the FEWSNET team can change the data.

Is there a need for an independent review of results reported?		x	Actual events validate or refute the projections and forecasts.

IF NO RELEVANT DATA WERE AVAILABLE	COMMENTS
If no recent relevant data are available for this indicator, why not?	NA
What concrete actions are now being undertaken to collect and report these data as soon as possible?	
When will data be reported?	

SUMMARY	COMMENTS
Based on the assessment relative to the five standards, what is the overall conclusion regarding the quality of the data?	The overall quality of the data is as excellent as the component parts allow. The data clearly meet the need to provide early warning of potential food security problems in Malawi.
Significance of limitations (if any):	Data on the number of persons trained appears accurate.
Actions needed to address limitations (given level of USAID control over data):	None is necessary at this time.

USAID/MALAWI DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	ECONOMIC GROWTH
Area:	21. Environment
Element:	21.1 Natural resources and biodiversity
Indicator title:	21. 1.1 Number of hectares under improved natural resource management as a result of USG assistance 21. 1.2 Number of hectares in areas of biological significance under improved management as a result of USG assistance (marine, terrestrial) 21. 1.4 Number of hectares in areas of biological significance showing improved biophysical conditions as a result of USG assistance (marine, terrestrial)
Is this a standard or custom indicator? If standard, make sure the title matches the title in the Indicator Handbooks.	__X_ Standard _____Custom
Data source(s):	_____ Survey/KAP __X_ Implementing partner reports _____ Other (Be specific)
USAID control over data:	_____ High (USAID is source and/or funds data collection)

USAID/MALAWI DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	ECONOMIC GROWTH
	_X Medium (Implementing partner is data source) ____ Low (Data are from a secondary source)
Partner or contractor who provided the data (if applicable):	Africa Parks (Majete) Ltd.
Year or period for which the data are being reported:	October 1, 2006, to September 30, 2007
Data assessment methodology:	The GH Tech team, Archanjel Chinkunda, USAID/Malawi M&E officer, and Patricia Ziwa, CTO, visited the Africa Parks program, where the team obtained an overview of the Africa Parks program and its performance management practices from Patricio Ndadzela, Project Coordinator. The team reviewed the partner PMP with particular emphasis on the indicators and the evidence used to determine whether they have been achieved. The team assessed the linkage between the partner's and USAID/Malawi's PMPs. The team crosschecked the partner's data collection methodology against the USAID-approved methodology as reflected in the DQA checklists. The team crosschecked partner and SO PMP indicators against those in the USAID/Malawi OP. The team selectively spot-checked Africa Parks files for base documents and documentation of the evidence demonstrating achievement of the indicator. For example, the team reviewed the procedures used to measure the number of hectares brought under improved management. The team also reviewed the techniques being used to measure improvement in biophysical conditions. The team spot-checked operational manuals to confirm the existence of written procedures. A DQA checklist was prepared on the indicators that Africa Parks is responsible for reporting on. Using the checklist as the point of departure, the team checked data from the partners for validity, reliability, precision, timeliness, and integrity. Validity was determined by checking for consistent application of the same criteria, formulas, and procedures at all levels of the process. Reliability was checked by determining if the partner used the same data collection methods from year to year, in this case the methodology for measuring the hectares involved in the program. The team checked timeliness by reviewing quarterly reports to determine the period in which data were reported from field sites to partner and from partner to USAID/Malawi. The team reviewed Africa Parks procedures to determine if they are adequate to determine integrity.
Date(s) of assessment:	November 5, 2007

USAID/MALAWI DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	ECONOMIC GROWTH
Assessment team members:	Archanjel Chinkunda, Patricia Ziwa, and Norman L. Olsen
For Office Use Only _____	

CATEGORY	YES	NO	COMMENTS
VALIDITY			
Is there a direct relationship between the program activity and what is being measured? If not, explain connection to the result.	x		The three indicators accurately measure the impact this activity is having in improving conditions in the Majete reserve.
Can the result be plausibly attributed to USG assistance?	x		Without USAID assistance, the activity would not be taking place; nor would the improvement in Majete reserve conditions.
Are the people collecting data qualified and properly supervised?	x		Majete reserve management staff trains Park Rangers in the use of the GPS units so that measurement is exceptionally precise. Reserve management staff closely supervise the Rangers.
Are steps taken to correct known data errors?	x		Reserve management staff reviews all data and promptly corrects any errors they detect.
Were known data collection problems appropriately assessed?	x		The management staff is aware of the difficult of accurately counting animal life. They have developed innovative survey techniques involving both aerial photography and ground–truthing.
Are steps being taken to limit transcription error?	x		All data are crosschecked.
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?		x	
RELIABILITY			
Is a consistent data collection process used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source?	x		The Majete Reserve has used the same procedures since the start of the project.
Are there procedures in place for periodic review of data collection, maintenance, and documentation in writing?	x		Reserve staff reviews data as they are collected.
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?		x	

TIMELINESS			
Is a regularized schedule of data collection in place to meet program management needs?	x		The data collection process is done on an on-going basis and is sufficient for management needs
Are data properly stored and readily available?	x		The data are stored on site. National Parks HQ has copies of the backed-up data.
PRECISION			
Is there a method for detecting duplicate data?	x		The survey techniques for specific areas significantly reduce the possibility of double-counting animals.
Is there a method for detecting missing data?	x		Cross-checking quickly identifies any missing data
INTEGRITY			
Are there proper safeguards in place to prevent unauthorized changes to the data?	x		Only Reserve management staff have access to the data.
Is there a need for an independent review of results reported?		x	

IF NO RELEVANT DATA WERE AVAILABLE	COMMENTS
If no recent relevant data are available for this indicator, why not?	NA
What concrete actions are now being undertaken to collect and report these data as soon as possible?	
When will data be reported?	

SUMMARY	COMMENTS
Based on the assessment relative to the five standards, what is the overall conclusion regarding the quality of the data?	Data quality meets USAID standards for managing the project and measuring progress in meeting the three indicators.
Significance of limitations (if any):	Measuring of initial environmental improvements (for example, the reduction of bush fires) is relatively straightforward. As the project progresses, more sophisticated techniques may be necessary to accurately measure higher-level improvements.
Actions needed to address limitations (given level of USAID control over data):	Continued site visits are strongly recommended.

USAID/NAME DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	ECONOMIC GROWTH
Area:	21. Environment
Element:	21.1 Natural resources and biodiversity
Indicator title:	21. 1.1 Number of hectares under improved natural resource management as a result of USG assistance 21. 1.2 Number of hectares in areas of biological significance under improved management as a result of USG assistance (marine, terrestrial) 21. 1.3 Number of hectares of natural resources showing improved biophysical conditions as a result of USG assistance Number of hectares in areas of biological significance showing improved biophysical conditions as a result of USG assistance (marine, terrestrial. 21. 1.5 Number of policies, laws, agreements, or regulations promoting sustainable natural resource management and conservation that are implemented as a result of USG assistance 21. 1.6 Number of people with increased economic benefits derived from sustainable natural resource management and conservation as a result of USG assistance (SD) 21. 1.7 Number of people receiving USG-supported training in natural resources management and/or biodiversity conservation (SD)
Is this a standard or custom indicator? If standard, make sure the title matches the title in the Indicator Handbooks.	__X_ Standard _____Custom
Data source(s):	_____ Survey/KAP __X_ Implementing partner reports _____ Other (Be specific)
USAID control over data:	_____ High (USAID is source and/or funds data collection) _X Medium (Implementing partner is data source) _____ Low (Data are from a secondary source)
Partner or contractor who provided the data (if applicable):	Community Partnerships for Sustainable Resource Management in Malawi (COMPASS II)
Year or period for which the data are being reported:	October 1, 2006, to September 30, 2007
Data assessment methodology:	The GH Tech team, Archanjel Chinkunda, USAID/Malawi M&E officer, and Patricia Ziwa, CTO, visited the

USAID/NAME DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	ECONOMIC GROWTH
	COMPASSII project. Acting Chief of Party John Dickson briefed us on the program and its performance management practices. The team reviewed the COMPASSII PMP with particular emphasis on the indicators and the evidence used to determine whether they have been achieved. The team assessed the linkage between the COMPASSII and USAID/Malawi PMPs. The team crosschecked the partner's data collection methodology against the USAID-approved methodology as reflected in the DQA checklists. The team crosschecked partner and SO PMP indicators against those in the USAID/Malawi OP. The team selectively spot-checked the partner's files for base documents and documentation of the evidence demonstrating achievement of the indicator (e.g., signed per diem receipts to verify attendance at training courses). The team spot-checked operational manuals to confirm the existence of written procedures. A DQA checklist was prepared on the indicators that COMPASSII is responsible for reporting on. Using the checklist as the point of departure, the team checked data from the partners for validity, reliability, precision, timeliness, and integrity. Validity was determined by checking for consistent application of the same criteria, formulas, and procedures at all levels of the process. Reliability was checked by determining if the partner used the same data collection methods from year to year. The team checked timeliness by reviewing quarterly reports to determine the period in which data were reported from field sites to partner and from partner to USAID/Malawi. The team spot-checked COMPASSII procedures to determine if they are adequate to determine integrity.
Date(s) of assessment:	November 5, 2007
Assessment team members:	Archanjel Chinkunda, Patricia Ziwa, and Norman L. Olsen
For Office Use Only _____	

CATEGORY	YES	NO	COMMENTS
VALIDITY			
Is there a direct relationship between the program activity and what is being measured? If not, explain connection to the result.	X		The seven indicators for the COMPASSII project accurately measure the progress being made on a comprehensive natural resources management project.
Can the result be plausibly attributed to USG assistance?	X		Without USAID assistance, this activity and the progress it is achieving would not be taking place.
Are the people collecting data qualified and properly supervised?	X		The Project M&E officer closely supervises data collection in all of its elements. That person also trains enumerators for the surveys done by the project.
Are steps taken to correct known data errors?	X		All data are carefully reviewed and any detected errors corrected.
Were known data collection problems appropriately assessed?	X		Surveys are typically the technique of choice for most data collection in this project. The techniques used conform to acceptable international practice.
Are steps being taken to limit transcription error?	X		The Chief of Party thoroughly reviewed any reports for transcription or other errors.
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?		X	
RELIABILITY			
Is a consistent data collection process used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source?	X		Basic procedures have been consistent since the beginning of the project.
Are there procedures in place for periodic review of data collection, maintenance and documented in writing?	X		Data are periodically reviewed, especially in preparation of quarterly reports for USAID. The team is concerned that, with the turnover in key personnel, the acting Chief of Party is not aware of the existence of written procedures.
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?		X	
TIMELINESS			
Is a regularized schedule of data collection in place to meet program management needs?	X		Data are regularly collected and meet the management needs of the project.
Are data properly stored and readily available?	X		Data are stored on site and backed up to DAI headquarters in the U.S.
PRECISION			
Is there a method for detecting duplicate data?	X		In general, the use of surveys in conjunction with GPS techniques substantially reduces the risk of duplicate data.
Is there a method for detecting missing data?	X		All data are thoroughly reviewed to detect any missing elements.

INTEGRITY			
Are there proper safeguards in place to prevent unauthorized changes to the data?	X		The project allows relatively open access to the data. However, there is little incentive for anyone to make unauthorized changes to the data.
Is there a need for an independent review of results reported?		X	The evaluations made on the project effectively serve as independent review.

IF NO RELEVANT DATA WERE AVAILABLE	COMMENTS
If no recent relevant data are available for this indicator, why not?	NA
What concrete actions are now being undertaken to collect and report these data as soon as possible?	
When will data be reported?	

SUMMARY	COMMENTS
Based on the assessment relative to the five standards, what is the overall conclusion regarding the quality of the data?	The current data meet USAID standards for management and reporting, but the team is concerned for the future. The acting Chief of Party is unaware of written procedures for data collection. The M&E person has left the project and is not being replaced because of budget constraints.
Significance of limitations (if any):	See above
Actions needed to address limitations (given level of USAID control over data):	USAID/Malawi should closely monitor the situation to ensure that data collection quality is maintained. In particular, for the next two quarterly reports the CTO and a representative of the Program Office should visit COMPASSII from two to four weeks before the quarterly report is due to review with the COP data being used for the report.

USAID/MALAWI DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	ECONOMIC GROWTH
Area:	20. Economic Opportunity
Element:	20.1 Inclusive financial markets
Indicator title:	20. 1.1 Number of clients at USG-assisted microfinance institutions (SD)
Is this a standard or custom indicator? If standard, make sure the title matches the title in the Indicator Handbooks.	__X_ Standard _____Custom
Data source(s):	_____ Survey/KAP __X_ Implementing partner reports _____ Other (Be specific)

USAID/MALAWI DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	ECONOMIC GROWTH
USAID control over data:	_____ High (USAID is source and/or funds data collection) _X Medium (Implementing partner is data source) _____ Low (Data are from a secondary source)
Partner or contractor who provided the data (if applicable):	Chemonics International
Year or period for which the data are being reported:	October 1, 2006, to September 30, 2007
Data assessment methodology:	The GH Tech team and Archanjel Chinkunda, USAID/Malawi M&E officer visited the Chemonics microfinance project. Victor Luboyeski, Chief of Party, briefed us on the project and its performance management practices. The team reviewed the Chemonics PMP with particular emphasis on the indicators and the evidence used to determine whether they have been achieved. The team assessed the linkage between partner and USAID/Malawi PMPs. The team crosschecked the partner's data collection methodology against the USAID-approved methodology as reflected in the DQA checklists. The team crosschecked partner and SO PMP indicators against indicators in the USAID/Malawi OP. The team selectively spot-checked the partner's files for base documents and documentation of the evidence demonstrating achievement of the indicator (e.g., signed per diem receipts to verify attendance at training courses). The team spot-checked operational manuals to confirm the existence of written procedures. A DQA checklist was prepared on the indicators that Chemonics is responsible for reporting on. Using the checklist as the point of departure, the team checked data from the partners for validity, reliability, precision, timeliness, and integrity. Validity was determined by checking for consistent application of the same criteria, formulas, and procedures at all levels of the process. Reliability was checked by determining if the partner used the same data collection methods from year to year. The team checked timeliness by reviewing quarterly reports to determine the period in which data were reported, from field sites to partner, and from partner to USAID/Malawi. The team reviewed Chemonics spot-checking procedures to determine if they are adequate to determine integrity.
Date(s) of assessment:	November 1, 2007
Assessment Team Members:	Barry Silverman, Archanjel Chinkunda, and Norman L. Olsen

USAID/MALAWI DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	ECONOMIC GROWTH
For Office Use Only _____	

CATEGORY	YES	NO	COMMENTS
VALIDITY			
Is there a direct relationship between the program activity and what is being measured? If not, explain connection to the result.	x		The project directly assists microfinance institutions.
Can the result be plausibly attributed to USG assistance?	x		Without USAID-funded assistance, the policy environment for microfinance would not have been positively changed.
Are the people collecting data qualified and properly supervised?	x		Supervision and training of the employees of both Chemonics and their partner microfinance institutions meet commercial banking standards.
Are steps taken to correct known data errors?	x		Both the M&E specialist and the COP actively review the quarterly data received from partners. Data that do not fit the trend lines or seem out of line with previous data for the same indicator are reviewed with the partner and changed if necessary.
Were known data collection problems appropriately assessed?	x		The single largest data collection problem is correctly accounting for the number of persons in a group receiving a loan. Chemonics has in place procedures to sort through this issue.
Are steps being taken to limit transcription error?	x		Partners submit to Chemonics a quarterly electronic report that virtually eliminates transcription error at that level. The problem is potentially more serious at the lending level, but crosschecking of data from quarter to quarter reduces the risk.
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?	x		Data issues were identified in the last annual report.
RELIABILITY			
Is a consistent data collection process used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source?	x		Procedures have been consistent since the inception of the project in 2004.
Are there procedures in place for periodic review of data collection, maintenance and documented in writing?	x		Written procedures are in place.

Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?	x		Data issues were identified in the last annual report.
TIMELINESS			
Is a regularized schedule of data collection in place to meet program management needs?	x		Chemonics partners record the data as the events occur. They report the data to Chemonics quarterly. Chemonics reports to USAID/Malawi quarterly.
Are data properly stored and readily available?	x		Data are stored at Chemonics and at partner locations.
PRECISION			
Is there a method for detecting duplicate data?	x		The quarterly review process specifically looks for duplicate data.
Is there a method for detecting missing data?	x		In its quarterly review process, Chemonics quickly identifies institutions that do not report on time or have missing data. Follow- up to seek out any missing data is immediate. There is a financial incentive to report data on time and accurately in that any financial support to the institution is delayed until the data are supplied.
INTEGRITY			
Are there proper safeguards in place to prevent unauthorized changes to the data?	x		
Is there a need for an independent review of results reported?		x	

IF NO RELEVANT DATA WERE AVAILABLE	COMMENTS
If no recent relevant data are available for this indicator, why not?	NA
What concrete actions are now being undertaken to collect and report these data as soon as possible?	
When will data be reported?	

SUMMARY	COMMENTS
Based on the assessment relative to the five standards, what is the overall conclusion regarding the quality of the data?	The quality of the data meets USAID standards. Data are fully adequate for both management and reporting purposes
Significance of limitations (if any):	Microfinance involves hundreds of thousands of accounts in an environment generally unfamiliar with basic banking procedures. Errors are likely, if not inevitable. Chemonics has in place systems that seem likely to minimize any limitations.
Actions needed to address limitations (given level of USAID control over data):	Continued active management and monitoring by USAID/Malawi staff are recommended.

USAID/MALAWI DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	INVESTING IN PEOPLE
Area:	PEPFAR: HIV/AIDS
Element:	Palliative Care
Indicator title:	6.1 Number of service outlets providing HIV-related palliative care (including TB/HIV) 6.2 Number of individuals provided with HIV-related palliative care (including TB/HIV) 6.3 Number of individuals trained to provide HIV palliative care (including TB/HIV)
Is this a standard or custom indicator? If standard, make sure the title matches the title in the Indicator Handbooks.	___ Standard __X__Custom - PEPFAR
Data source(s):	_____ Survey/KAP __X_ Implementing partner reports _____ Other (Be specific)
USAID control over data:	_____ High (USAID is source and/or funds data collection) _X Medium (Implementing partner is data source) _____ Low (Data are from a secondary source)
Partner or contractor who provided the data (if applicable):	Family Health International (FHI)
Year or period for which the data are being reported:	October 1, 2006, to September 30, 2007
Data assessment methodology:	A DQA checklist was prepared on the indicators that FHI was responsible for reporting on. Using the checklist as the point of departure, the team checked data from the partners for validity, reliability, precision, timeliness, and integrity. Validity was determined by checking for consistent application of the same criteria, formulas, and procedures at all levels of the process. Reliability was checked by determining if the partner used the same data collection methods from year to year. The team checked timeliness by reviewing quarterly reports to determine the period in which data were reported from field sites to partner and from partner to USAID/Malawi. The team reviewed FHI spot-checking procedures to determine if those procedures are adequate to determine integrity.
Date(s) of Assessment:	
Assessment Team Members:	Barry Silverman, Patrick Wesner

USAID/MALAWI DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	INVESTING IN PEOPLE
For Office Use Only _____	

CATEGORY	YES	NO	COMMENTS
VALIDITY			
Is there a direct relationship between the program activity and what is being measured? If not, explain connection to the result.	x		FHI appears to have been responsive to the findings of the RIG PEPFAR data audit and there was a direct relationship between the program activities and the data reported.
Can the result be plausibly attributed to USG assistance?	x		The results were attributable to USAID-supported interventions.
Are the people collecting data qualified and properly supervised?	x		Data collectors were qualified and properly supervised.
Are steps taken to correct known data errors?	x		Crosschecking and spot-checking detected errors that were corrected.
Were known data collection problems appropriately assessed?	x		FHI was responsive and corrected data collection issues identified by the PEPFAR audit.
Are steps being taken to limit transcription error?	x		Crosschecking and spot-checking detected errors that were corrected.
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?		x	
RELIABILITY			
Is a consistent data collection process used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source?	x		FHI no longer implements these activities but previously used consistent data collection processes for collecting FY2007 data.
Are there procedures in place for periodic review of data collection, maintenance and documented in writing?	x		Written procedures were in place.
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?		x	
TIMELINESS			
Is a regularized schedule of data collection in place to meet program management needs?	x		Data collection was timely for FY2007 indicators.
Are data properly stored and readily available?	x		Data were properly stored and were made available to the team when requested.

PRECISION			
Is there a method for detecting duplicate data?	x		FHI did develop a process to detect duplicate and missing data.
Is there a method for detecting missing data?	x		FHI did develop a process to detect duplicate and missing data.
INTEGRITY			
Are there proper safeguards in place to prevent unauthorized changes to the data?	x		Only authorized staff had access to the data.
Is there a need for an independent review of results reported?		x	

IF NO RELEVANT DATA WERE AVAILABLE	COMMENTS
If no recent relevant data are available for this indicator, why not?	NA
What concrete actions are now being undertaken to collect and report these data as soon as possible?	
When will data be reported?	

SUMMARY	COMMENTS
Based on the assessment relative to the five standards, what is the overall conclusion regarding the quality of the data?	FHI appears to have been responsive to the PEPFAR audit findings and the FY2007 data appear to meet the data quality standards. USAID/Malawi is currently conducting a detailed review of all PEPFAR partners.
Significance of limitations (if any):	
Actions needed to address limitations (given level of USAID control over data):	USAID/Malawi is currently conducting a detailed review of all PEPFAR partners.

USAID/MALAWI DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	INVESTING IN PEOPLE
Area:	PEPFAR: HIV/AIDS
Element:	Palliative Care
Indicator title:	6.1 Number of service outlets providing HIV-related palliative care (including TB/HIV) 6.2 Number of individuals provided with HIV-related palliative care (including TB/HIV) 6.3 Number of individuals trained to provide HIV palliative care (including TB/HIV)
Is this a standard or custom indicator? If standard, make sure the title matches the title in the Indicator Handbooks.	___ Standard __X__Custom - PEPFAR

USAID/MALAWI DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	INVESTING IN PEOPLE
Data source(s):	_____ Survey/KAP __X_ Implementing partner reports _____ Other (Be Specific)
USAID control over data:	_____ High (USAID is source and/or funds data collection) _X Medium (Implementing partner is data source) _____ Low (Data are from a secondary source)
Partner or contractor who provided the data (if applicable):	PACT/Malawi
Year or period for which the data are being reported:	October 1, 2006, to September 30, 2007
Data assessment methodology:	A DQA checklist was prepared on the indicators that PACT was responsible for reporting on. Using checklist as the point of departure, the team checked data from the partners for validity, reliability, precision, timeliness, and integrity. Validity was determined by checking for consistent application of the same criteria, formulas, and procedures at all levels of the process. Reliability was checked by determining if the partner used the same data collection methods from year to year. The team checked timeliness by reviewing quarterly reports to determine the period in which data were reported, from field sites to partner, and from partner to USAID/Malawi. The team reviewed PACT spot-checking procedures to determine if they adequate to determine integrity.
Date(s) of assessment:	
Assessment Team Members:	Barry Silverman, Patrick Wesner
For Office Use Only _____	

CATEGORY	YES	NO	COMMENTS
VALIDITY			
Is there a direct relationship between the program activity and what is being measured? If not, explain connection to the result.	x		The FY2007 indicator data have a direct relationship to PACT's home-based and community-based palliative care activities.
Can the result be plausibly attributed to USG assistance?	x		The results were attributable to USAID-supported interventions.
Are the people collecting data qualified and properly supervised?	x		PACT uses a training-of-trainers technique to train subpartner M&E staff, who in turn train volunteer data collectors. There is an extensive supervision process.
Are steps taken to correct known data errors?	x		Crosschecking and spot-checking detected errors that were corrected.
Were known data collection problems appropriately assessed?	x		PACT uses spot-checks to identify and correct data collection problems. The team noted that one subpartner was having some difficulty with computer skills and training is planned to rectify this issue.
Are steps being taken to limit transcription error?	x		Crosschecking and spot-checking detected errors that were corrected.
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?		x	
RELIABILITY			
Is a consistent data collection process used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source?	x		PACT has just begun to implement these activities. USAID/Malawi should review consistency in data collection over the next several months. Subpartners used different data collection instruments; there should be an attempt to harmonize the forms.
Are there procedures in place for periodic review of data collection, maintenance and documented in writing?	x		Written procedures are in place.
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?		x	
TIMELINESS			
Is a regularized schedule of data collection in place to meet program management needs?	x		Data collection was timely for FY2007 indicators.
Are data properly stored and readily available?	x		Data are properly stored and were made available to the team when requested.
PRECISION			
Is there a method for detecting duplicate data?	x		Crosschecking detects and corrects duplicate data. This is not perceived to be a major problem.
Is there a method for detecting missing data?	x		Crosschecking detects and corrects missing data. This is not perceived to be a major problem.

INTEGRITY			
Are there proper safeguards in place to prevent unauthorized changes to the data?	x		Only authorized staff had access to the data.
Is there a need for an independent review of results reported?		x	

IF NO RELEVANT DATA WERE AVAILABLE	COMMENTS
If no recent relevant data are available for this indicator, why not?	NA
What concrete actions are now being undertaken to collect and report these data as soon as possible?	
When will data be reported?	

SUMMARY	COMMENTS
Based on the assessment relative to the five standards, what is the overall conclusion regarding the quality of the data?	PACT has processes and procedures in place that ensure that indicator data meet the data quality standards.
Significance of limitations (if any):	
Actions needed to address limitations (given level of USAID control over data):	USAID/Malawi is currently conducting a detail review of all PEPFAR partners.

ANNEX D: MCC INDICATOR NARATIVES AND CHECKLISTS

PARTNER—CASALS & ASSOCIATES

Casals & Associates is implementing the MCC Threshold Country Program–supported Strengthening Government Integrity Program to Support Malawian Efforts to Roll Back Corruption and Encourage Fiscal Responsibility. The program focuses on a number of areas, such as procurement, debt management, budget management, domestic revenue, and M&E. The institutions involved are the Ministry of Finance, Malawi Revenue Authority, Reserve Bank of Malawi, Ministry of Economic Planning & Development, Ministry of Justice, Malawi Police Service, and some civil society groups.

The Strengthening Government Integrity Program focuses on capacity building and strengthening institutions and the public in order to fight corruption. The GH Tech Team assessed data based on two selected indicators for the program. These are:

- Media Council (MC) established.
- Sovereign credit rating moves from CCC+ to B- (positive outlook).

DQA—CASALS & ASSOCIATES

The GH Tech team, Stephen Mwale, USAID/Malawi Program Management (Governance) Specialist, and Archanjel Chinkunda, USAID/Malawi M&E Officer, visited the Casals Offices. Amanda Willet, Deputy Chief of Party for the Program, briefed the team, giving an overview of the program and its performance management practices. The team reviewed the partner's PMP with particular emphasis on the indicators and the evidence used to determine whether they have been achieved. The GH Tech team assessed the linkage between the Casals and USAID/Malawi PMPs and crosschecked the partner's data collection methodology against the USAID-approved methodology as reflected in the DQA checklists. The team also crosschecked partner and SO PMP indicators against those in the MCC Threshold Country Program and spot-checked files for base documents and documentation of the evidence demonstrating achievement of the indicator. The team also spot-checked operational manuals to confirm the existence of written procedures and spot-checked attendance at training courses and property receipts.

The two indicators accurately measure the performance of the program. Training sessions are adequately supervised and qualified personnel conduct the training. Procedures for data collection have been consistent since the beginning of the project. Transcription errors are addressed through spot-checking; double-counting is not an issue as the USAID Train-net program is used to account for trainees. This also helps to eliminate transcription errors.

TABLE 38: DQA STANDARDS SUMMARY–CASALS & ASSOCIATES

STANDARD	YES	NO	COMMENT
Validity	X		See text above
Integrity	X		See text above
Precision	X		See text above
Reliability	X		See text above
Timeliness	X		See text above

The data meet DQA and USAID standards for managing and reporting.

USAID/NAME DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	GOVERNING JUSTLY AND DEMOCRATICALLY
Area:	N/A
Element:	N/A
Indicator title:	Media Council (MC) established Sovereign Credit rating moves from CCC+ to B- (positive outlook)
Is this a standard or custom indicator? If standard, make sure the title matches the title in the Indicator Handbooks.	___ Standard __X__Custom
Data source(s):	_____ Survey/KAP __X__ Implementing partner _____ Other (Be specific)
USAID control over data:	_____ High (USAID is source and/or funds data collection) _x__ Medium (Implementing partner is data source) _____ Low (Data are from a secondary source)
Partner or contractor who provided the data (if applicable):	Casals and Associates
Year or period for which the data are being reported:	FY 2007
Data assessment methodology:	The GH Tech team and Archanjel Chinkunda, USAID/Malawi M&E Officer, visited the Casals MCC program office. Amanda Willett, Deputy Chief of Party, gave us obtained an overview of how the Casals program, highly focused on training, fits into the overall MCC program. The team also obtained an understanding of Casals performance management practices. The team reviewed the Casals PMP with particular emphasis on the indicators and the evidence used to determine whether they have been achieved. The team assessed the linkage between the Casals and the USAID/Malawi PMPs. The team crosschecked the partner's data collection methodology against the USAID-approved methodology as reflected in the DQA checklists. The team spot-checked the partner's files for base documents and documentation of evidence demonstrating achievement of the indicator (e.g., attendance at training courses and property receipt lists). The team spot-checked operational manuals to confirm the existence of written procedures. A DQA checklist was prepared on Casals. Using the checklist as the point of departure, the team checked data for validity, reliability, precision, timeliness, and

USAID/NAME DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	GOVERNING JUSTLY AND DEMOCRATICALLY
	integrity. Validity was determined by checking for consistent application of the same criteria, formulas, and procedures at all levels of the process. Reliability was checked by determining if the partner used the same data collection methods from year to year. The team checked timeliness by reviewing quarterly reports to determine the period in which data were reported from field sites to partner and from partner to USAID/Malawi. The team reviewed the Casals spot-checking procedures to determine if they are adequate to determine integrity.
Date(s) of assessment:	November 2, 2007
Assessment team members:	Stephen Mwale, Archanjel Chinkunda, and Norman L. Olsen
For Office Use Only _____	

CATEGORY	YES	NO	COMMENTS
VALIDITY			
Is there a direct relationship between the program activity and what is being measured? If not, explain connection to the result.	x		In assisting Malawi to prepare for possible participation in the MCC program Casals provides training in a range of disciplines necessary for financial and managerial accountability. It also provides equipment, largely IT, to upgrade the capacity of the GOM. Casals is accurately measuring these activities.
Can the result be plausibly attributed to USG assistance?	x		Without USAID assistance, these activities would not be happening, and Malawi would have no chance of qualifying for inclusion in the MCC program.
Are the people collecting data qualified and properly supervised?	x		Casals actively supervises all aspects of the various training programs, including accounting for who is trained. It is similarly active in accounting for equipment purchases and distribution.
Are steps taken to correct known data errors?	x		Accounting for persons trained and equipment purchased and distributed is relatively straightforward.
Were known data collection problems appropriately assessed?	x		See above
Are steps being taken to limit transcription error?	x		Use of the USAID Train-net program to account for trainees tends to virtually eliminate transcription error in accounting for participants.

Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?		x	
RELIABILITY			
Is a consistent data collection process used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source?	x		The same procedures have been used since the activity began in April 2006.
Are there procedures in place for periodic review of data collection, maintenance and documented in writing?	x		
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?		x	
TIMELINESS			
Is a regularized schedule of data collection in place to meet program management needs?	x		Data are reported quarterly which is fully adequate for management needs.
Are data properly stored and readily available?	x		Casals stores data on site in both electronic and hard copies.
PRECISION			
Is there a method for detecting duplicate data?	x		The Train-net procedures virtually eliminate double-counting of trainees.
Is there a method for detecting missing data?	x		Casals seeks out any missing data.
INTEGRITY			
Are there proper safeguards in place to prevent unauthorized changes to the data?	x		
Is there a need for an independent review of results reported?		x	The ultimate check is MCC approval for Malawi to enter the MCC program.

IF NO RELEVANT DATA WERE AVAILABLE	COMMENTS
If no recent relevant data are available for this indicator, why not?	NA
What concrete actions are now being undertaken to collect and report these data as soon as possible?	
When will data be reported?	

SUMMARY	COMMENTS
Based on the assessment relative to the five standards, what is the overall conclusion regarding the quality of the data?	The CASALS data meet USAID standards.
Significance of limitations (if any):	The data are input (equipment) and output (participants) data, which do not directly measure impact.
Actions needed to address limitations (given level of USAID control over data):	Continued management attention to the overall MCC program is recommended.

PARTNER: STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK (SUNY)

Overview: SUNY is implementing a project for Strengthening National Assembly Oversight to Curb Corruption and Enhance Fiscal Discipline in the Public Sector with support from the MCC Threshold Country Plan. Within the broader MCC program, the SUNY project focuses on the National Assembly of Malawi, with activities designed to support Parliament's reform efforts at more independence from the Executive, more effective oversight of the Executive, and improved legislative processes, particularly relating to legislation against corruption and promoting fiscal discipline.

The objective of the project is to support a Parliament that becomes formally and financially more independent from the Executive, increasingly equipped to oversee the Executive budget and expenditure, and better able to review and improve legislation—especially legislation aiming to curb corruption and fiscal mismanagement.

The GH Tech team assessed data for the following two indicators for the SUNY project:

- National Assembly (NA) has more control over own budget.
- Number of civil society groups testifying before the NA triples.

DQA—SUNY

The GH Tech Team, Archanjel Chinkunda, USAID/Malawi M&E Officer, and Stephen Mwale, USAID/Malawi Program Management (Governance) Specialist visited SUNY offices, where the Chief of Party, Dye Mawindo, and the Deputy Chief of Party, Sylvester Masamvu, briefed us on the SUNY Malawi National Assembly Project. The team reviewed the SUNY PMP with particular emphasis on the two selected indicators and the evidence used to determine whether they have been achieved. The GH Tech team assessed the linkage between the SUNY and USAID/Malawi PMPs, crosschecked the SUNY data collection methodology against the USAID-approved methodology as reflected in the DQA checklists, and crosschecked SUNY and SO PMP indicators in the MCC Threshold Country Plan. The team spot-checked SUNY files based on documents and documentation of evidence demonstrating achievement of the indicators and spot-checked operational manuals to confirm the existence of written procedures and documentation tracing movement of legislation through Parliament, including attendance lists for training and committee meetings.

The SUNY program builds the capacity of the Malawi National Assembly through a number of interventions. These include training of Members of Parliament and National Assembly staff; purchase of equipment such as computers; study tours; strengthening parliamentary committees, and various other activities.

The two indicators for the SUNY project accurately measure the progress being made on the Malawi National Assembly Program. The program uses a system of internal checks whereby the Chief of Party and Deputy thoroughly reviewed any reports for transcription. All trainings are well supervised and are carried out by trained and qualified staff. Basic procedures have been consistent since the beginning of the program. Written procedures are in place to guide data collection, review, and maintenance. The program allows open access to the data, but there is little incentive for anyone to make unauthorized changes to data. The use of the local area network and password protection also prevent unauthorized changes.

TABLE 39: DQA STANDARDS SUMMARY—SUNY

STANDARD	YES	NO	COMMENT
Validity	X		See text above
Integrity	X		See text above
Precision	X		See text above
Reliability	X		See text above
Timeliness	X		See text above

The data quality meets USAID standards for managing the project and measuring progress in meeting the two indicators. It is recommended that Mission staff periodically meet with project staff to discuss data issues and to crosscheck records randomly.

DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST

USAID/MALAWI DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	
OBJECTIVE:	N/A
Area:	N/A
Element:	N/A
Indicator title:	National Assembly (NA) has more control over own budget. Number of civil society groups testifying before the NA triples.
Is this a standard or custom indicator? If standard, make sure the title matches the title in the Indicator Handbooks.	___ Standard _X___Custom
Data source(s):	_____ Survey/KAP __X__ Implementing partner reports _____ Other (Be Specific)
USAID control over data:	_____ High (USAID is source and/or funds data collection) X _Medium (Implementing partner is data source) _____ Low (Data are from a secondary source)
Partner or contractor who provided the data (if applicable):	State University of New York (SUNY)
Year or period for which the data are being reported:	October 1, 2006, to September 30, 2007
Data assessment methodology:	The GH Tech team, Archanjel Chinkunda, USAID/Malawi M&E officer, and Stephen Mwale, CTO, visited the SUNY--MCC program office. Dye Mawindo Chief of Party, and Sylvester Masamvu, Deputy Chief of Party, provided an overview of SUNY program and their performance management practices. The team reviewed the SUNY PMP with particular emphasis on the indicators and the evidence used to determine whether they have been achieved. The team assessed the linkage between the SUNY and MCC PMPs. The team crosschecked the SUNY data collection methodology against the USAID-approved methodology as reflected in the DQA checklists. The team spot-checked the SUNY files for base documents and documentation of the

USAID/MALAWI	
	evidence demonstrating achievement of the indicator. For example, the team checked to see that accurate attendance lists are kept on training courses. The team spot-checked operational manuals to confirm the existence of written procedures. The team also spot-checked documentation tracing movement of legislation through parliament. A DQA checklist was prepared on SUNY. Using the checklist as the point of departure, the team checked data for validity, reliability, precision, timeliness, and integrity. Validity was determined by checking for consistent application of the same criteria, formulas, and procedures at all levels of the process. Reliability was checked by determining if the partner used the same data collection methods from year to year. The team checked timeliness by reviewing quarterly reports to determine the period in which data were reported from field sites to partner and from partner to USAID/Malawi. The team reviewed SUNY procedures for tracking legislation, committee meetings, and final outcomes to see if they are adequate to determine integrity.
Date(s) of Assessment:	November 9, 2007
Assessment Team Members:	Archanjel Chinkunda, Stephen Mwale, and Norman L. Olsen
For Office Use Only _____	

CATEGORY	YES	NO	COMMENTS
VALIDITY			
Is there a direct relationship between the program activity and what is being measured? If not, explain connection to the result.	x		The SUNY indicator accurately reflects the influence of Parliament over national policy.
Can the result be plausibly attributed to USG assistance?	x		Without USAID assistance, Parliament would not be asserting anywhere near as much influence over national policy. The team notes that many Malawians believe it is in part because of this influence that corruption is declining.
Are the people collecting data qualified and properly supervised?	x		SUNY has in place adequate systems for tracking legislation and has suitably trained its personnel to provide the data for those systems. Supervision appears satisfactory.
Are steps taken to correct known data errors?	x		SUNY personnel are in daily contact with both MPs and Parliament staff to detect error and correct it.
Were known data collection problems appropriately assessed?	x		SUNY essentially takes a 100% sample of overt Parliamentary actions affecting the passage of legislation.
Are steps being taken to limit transcription error?	NA		
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?		x	
RELIABILITY			
Is a consistent data collection process used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source?	x		SUNY's processes have been stable since the beginning of the activity.
Are there procedures in place for periodic review of data collection, maintenance and documented in writing?	x		The data are reviewed in biweekly reports to SUNY, and quarterly and annual reports to USAID.
Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?		x	
TIMELINESS			
Is a regularized schedule of data collection in place to meet program management needs?	x		The data collection process is sufficiently detailed and timely to meet all management needs.
Are data properly stored and readily available?	x		Data are stored on site and backed up to Albany
PRECISION			
Is there a method for detecting duplicate data?	x		The Chief of Party and Deputy thoroughly review all data. In a project of this type, double-counting is not a significant issue.
Is there a method for detecting missing data?	x		See above

INTEGRITY			
Are there proper safeguards in place to prevent unauthorized changes to the data?	x		Access to the data is limited.
Is there a need for an independent review of results reported?		x	A project evaluation is scheduled prior to the end of the project.

IF NO RELEVANT DATA WERE AVAILABLE	COMMENTS
If no recent relevant data are available for this indicator, why not?	NA
What concrete actions are now being undertaken to collect and report these data as soon as possible?	
When will data be reported?	

SUMMARY	COMMENTS
Based on the assessment relative to the five standards, what is the overall conclusion regarding the quality of the data?	The data meet USAID standards for managing the project and for reporting.
Significance of limitations (if any):	The length of the project is very short for achieving significant long-term improvements in parliamentary performance.
Actions needed to address limitations (given level of USAID control over data):	Continued oversight is recommended.

ANNEX E: PERSONS CONTACTED

USAID/MALAWI

Richard Kimball, Acting Mission Director
Patrick Wesner, Program Officer
Emmie Kamanga, Program Budget Specialist
Amanda Willett, Deputy Chief of Party/Training & Capacity Building Specialist
Catherine Berkenshire-Scott, Strategic Information Liaison Advisor
Stephen Raphael Mwale, MCC Governance Specialist
Ramsey Sosola, CTO/Deputy Team Leader, Education Team
Ernest Achtell, Avian Influenza Coordinator
Patricia M. Ziwa, CTO, Sustainable Economic Growth & Education
Phyles Kachingwe, Activity Manager
Florence Nkosi, CTO, Education Team
Alisa Cameron, Team Leader, Health Team
Marisol Perez, Team Leader, Education Team
Mark Visocky, Team Leader for Sustainable Economic Growth
Dr. Paul J. Kaiser, Team Leader, MCC Democracy and Governance Program
Nyembezi Mfune, USAID/Malawi Program Acquisition & Assistance Specialist
Lily Banda-Maliro USAID Deputy Team Leader (Health Office)
Archanjel Chinkunda, M&E Specialist
Catherine Chiphazi, Child Health Specialist/CTO, Health Office
Violet Orchardson, Activity Manager/Nutritionist
Humphreys Shumba, CTO

USAID/WASHINGTON

William (Bill) Penoyar, Regional Advisor, Office of Southern Africa

AED EMIS PROGRAM

Fahim Akbar, Chief of Party, EQUIP2
Chandiwira Nyirenda, Education Planner, EQUIP2
Martin Masanche, Senior Education Planner, EQUIP2
Enock Matale, Assistant Statistician, EQUIP2

JHPIEGO

Abigail A. Kyei, Country Director

FAMILY HEALTH INTERNATIONAL

Margaret Kaseje, County Director
Dafter Khembo, M&E Officer
Tiwonge Moyo, Program Officer

FEWSNET

Sam Chimwaza, Country Representative
Evance Chapasuka, Deputy Country Representative

WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY

Zwide D. Jere, Director, Total Landcare
Dr. W. Trent Bunderson, Director, WSU East and Southern Africa, Total Landcare

CHEMONICS

Victor Luboyeski, Chief of Party Deepening Micro Finance Project

COMPASS II, DAI

John Dickson, Acting Chief of Party

POPULATION SERVICES INTERNATIONAL/MALAWI

John Justino, Resident Director
Alfred Zulu, Director of Administration & Human Resources
Michael Kainga, Internal Auditor
Andrew Miller, Director of Communications

AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH

Simon Mawindo, Chief of Party, MTTA
Cassandra I. Jessee, Deputy Chief of Party, PSSP
Dr. Hartford Mchazime, Deputy Chief of Party, MTTA
Chaplain Katumbi, M&E Specialist, MTTA
Nick Shawa, Data Management Officer, PSSP

AFRICA PARKS (MAJETE) LTD.

Patricio Ndalzela, Project Coordinator
Martin Bruij, Finance Officer

IRI

Simon Richmond, Chief of Party, Educational Development Center
Carrie Lewis, Education Advisor, EDC
Jennifer Kennedy, Project Coordinator, Radio, EDC
Julie Kachasu, Script Writer, EDC

UNICEF

Ketema Aschenaki Bizuneh, Project Officer, Head of Child Health Unit

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK (SUNY)

Dye Mawindo, Chief of Party, MCC Threshold Country Program
Silvester Masamvu, Deputy Chief of Party, MCC Threshold Country Program

U.S. EMBASSY, LILONGWE

Kalezi Zimba, Military Program Assistant, DOD
John Letvin, Pol/Mil officer, DOD

KNVC/MSH

June D. Mwafulira, TBCAP Project Coordinator
Maxwell Moyo, TBCAP M&E Specialist

CDC MALARIA ALERT PROGRAM

Carl Campbell, Chief of Party for the Program
Nyson Chizani, Data Management Specialist

I-LIFE CONSORTIUM (CARE/MALAWI)

Scott McNiven, Chief of Party
Cristina Hanson, Program Management Unit (PMU)
Dr. T.D. Jose, M&E Manager, PMU
Fidelis Sinani, PMU
Bena Musembi, PMU
Dziko Chatata, M&E Evaluation Officer
Aliza Myers, PMU

MANAGEMENT SCIENCES FOR HEALTH—BILATERAL PROGRAM

Rudi Thetard, Chief of Party

DELIVER II (JOHN SNOW INC.)

Jayne Waweru, Country Director
Evance Moyo, Assistant Logistics Management Information Associate
Elias Mwalabu, Assistant Logistics Management Information Associate

ADVENTIST HEALTH SERVICES

Florence Chipungu, AHS, Director
Joseph Mwandira, Project Manager
Peter Kambalametore, FP Coordinator
Dorothy Gomani, Data Entry Clerk

PACT/MALAWI

Matthew Tiedemann, Chief of Party
Janet Chime, HIV/AIDS Senior Technical Advisor
Cecilia Maganga, Monitoring and Evaluation Officer
Patrick Phoso, Program Officer, HIV/AIDS

LAND O'LAKES

Gretchen Villegas, Country Manager, Malawi Dairy Development Alliance
Peter G. Ngoma, M&E Specialist, Malawi Dairy Development Alliance

COMPASSII, DAI

John Dickson, Acting Chief of Party

THE SCOTTISH PARLIAMENT

Ann Nelson, Director of Legal Services

For more information, please visit
http://www.ghtechproject.com/resources/

Global Health Technical Assistance Project

1250 Eye St., NW, Suite 1100

Washington, DC 20005

Tel: (202) 521-1900

Fax: (202) 521-1901

www.ghtechproject.com